


REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01736 4461

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMD
1893.
JUL-NOV



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

THE
METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

VOLUME LXXV.—FIFTH SERIES, VOLUME IX.

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, D.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON.
CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & CURTS.
1893.

706229

METHODIST REVIEW.

JULY, 1893.

ART. I.—A SUPPRESSED CHAPTER OF RECENT CHURCH HISTORY.

It is well known that the Lambeth Conference of Episcopal bishops which met in London in the summer of 1888 laid down as a platform for Christian union the same principles as those which, two years previously, had been enunciated by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. These principles were:

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "containing all things necessary to salvation" and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
2. The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.
3. The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself—baptism and the supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him.
4. The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church.

It is generally understood that by the acceptance of the historic episcopate, whatever else that phrase may mean, there is implied the acknowledgment of the necessity of episcopal ordination for the validity of ministerial functions. This is the interpretation placed upon the phrase by some of the bishops who participated in the Conference. Thus, in the eloquent and able charge of Bishop William Croswell Doane, of Albany, he described the unity which the Conference sought as the "bringing back to the old type oneness all these large and powerful bodies of religious

men who have lost the order and, to say the least of it, have departed from the proportionate holding of the faith." "Unless we maintain our order intact," he says again, "and hold fast positively to every article of faith which the Church has set forth in the ancient creeds, we have nothing whatever to offer those whom we seek to draw into a closer oneness with ourselves. If these things are important they are trusts which we cannot surrender, no matter how tempting the proposal may seem to be. If they are not important, then we stand before God and men guilty of maintaining a perpetual separation between ourselves and other Christian men and Christian bodies upon points not essential to the divine constitution of the Church and the divine deposit of the faith." * So also Bishop Mylne, of Bombay, who has given the best and fullest exposition of this part of the action of the Conference, says: "Where the bodies to be approached, should it prove possible, are without apostolic orders, there the attitude adopted was quite different [from that adopted in the case of the Greek, Roman, and other Churches which possess the apostolic ministry]. There we spoke of the great deposit committed to us, of which we are bound to be faithful stewards, and said plainly that we should not be faithful stewards if we should fail to maintain our position 'either as to faith or discipline.' We laid down with the utmost clearness that the 'maintenance of the historic episcopate' was a condition of intercommunion. And, while recognizing frankly and generously the blessing which has rested on their labors, we refrained from saying a single word which could recognize the validity of any ministry which does not come straight from the apostles." † There is no doubt that the words of these bishops fairly represent the feelings of their brethren. "For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us," say they in their encyclical letter, "so that the ideal of the one flock under the one shepherd may be realized, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit entrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender."

* Diocese of Albany: the Bishop's Address, p. 20. 1888.

† *Counsels and Principles of the Lambeth Conference of 1888: a Charge*, p. 26. Bombay, 1889.

There is, however, great difference of opinion among Episcopalians as to the importance to be attached to the episcopate. Though many hold that the threefold ministry—consisting of deacons, presbyters, and bishops—is necessary to the being of the Church, others hold that, while such a ministry is highly desirable, it is by no means necessary. And it would indeed be remarkable if the views of this latter class were not voiced in the Lambeth Conference, among a body of men so much given to independence of thinking as are the clergy of the Anglican communion.

We desire now to give a bit of the internal history of the Lambeth Conference which is not so well known to those outside of the Episcopal Church—which in fact that Conference, or many members of it, did not desire should be made public—a bit of history which finds no place upon the official proceedings, and for the knowledge of which we are indebted to an illustrious prelate, Dr. Charles Wordsworth, who repudiates the High Church theory of the ministry, and who has long labored for Christian union on the basis of the mutual recognition of the validity of each other's orders on the part of the Protestant Churches. Bishop Wordsworth has been severely scored by some of his High Church brethren for divulging the report of which we are now to speak. It seems to have been the determination of the Conference that the catholic proposals of their committee should never see the light. But the Bishop of St. Andrew's did not so understand the matter, and therefore, to the great disgust of the *Church Quarterly Review*, he tells the whole story in one of his late pamphlets.

The subject of Christian union, or home reunion, as they call it in England, was referred by the Conference to a large and influential committee of seventeen bishops, fairly representing the scholarship of the body as well as the geographical extension of the Church, to which Bishops Stubbs (the historian) and Reichel were afterward added. Dr. Alfred Barry, the late principal of Cheltenham College, recently Bishop of Sydney and Metropolitan of Australia, was made chairman, and to his hands was committed the preparation of the report. That report, after laying down the four principles we have already quoted, went on to interpret and apply the last principle in a way quite different from the understanding

of it by Bishops Doane and Mylne, and, we fear, the majority of their compeers:

It will be seen that, as one of the elements of the proposed basis of reunion, your committee have, in accordance with the principles of the Church of England as declared in the preface to her ordinal, included the "historic episcopate," with such adaptations as may be in different portions of the Church required by present circumstances and conditions. But they observe that, while the Church in her twenty-third article lays down the necessity of the ministry as a sacred order commissioned by those who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, and while for herself she has defined the latter term by insisting in her own communion on episcopal ordination, she has nowhere declared that all other constituted ministry is null and void. They also note that in the troubled period following the Reformation (up to the year 1662) ministers not episcopally ordained were in certain cases recognized as fit to hold office in the Church of England, and that some chief authorities, even in the High Church school, defended and acted upon this recognition in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The question, therefore, which presents itself to them is this, whether the present circumstances of Christianity among us are such as to constitute a sufficient reason for such exceptional action now? To this question, looking to the infinite blessings which must result from any right approach toward reunion, not only in Great Britain and Ireland, but in the American and colonial communities, looking also to the unquestioned fact that upon some concession upon this matter depends, humanity speaking, the only hope of such an approach, they cannot but perceive that our present condition, perhaps in a higher degree than at any former time, justifies an affirmative answer. They therefore humbly submit the following resolution to the wisdom of the Conference:

That, in the opinion of this committee, Conferences such as we have recommended are likely to be fruitful, under God's blessing of practical result only if undertaken with willingness on behalf of the Anglican communion, while holding firmly the threefold order of the ministry as the normal rule of the Church to be observed in the future, to recognize, in spite of what we must conceive as irregularity, the ministerial character of those ordained in nonepiscopal communions, through whom, as ministers, it has pleased God visibly to work for the salvation of souls and the advancement of his kingdom, and to provide, in such way as may be agreed upon, for the acceptance of such ministers as fellow-workers with us in the service of the Lord Jesus Christ.

In a footnote to this report there were given several instances of the recognition of nonepiscopal ordinations in the Church of England, and the opinions of Bishop Cosin and Archbishop

Bramhall on the subject. Every member of the committee who was present and voted gave his hearty voice to this resolution, with only two exceptions. "When the resolution was voted for in the committee only two voted against it, and when it was read again (at a subsequent and final meeting) *it was approved by several bishops not present at the previous division*, so that it had the assent of over *twelve members* of the committee." * "Many of my brethren," continues Bishop Machray, a member of the committee, "who yield to none as churchmen, hold these views. I trust I violate no confidence when I tell that dear Bishop Whipple, of Minnesota, having to leave the committee room from his infirm health, placed his hand on my shoulder and said, 'My whole spirit goes with that resolution.'"

Now, we bid the reader notice the force of these concessions. Here are over a dozen bishops of the Anglican Church, selected as specially interested and competent to deal with the question, unanimously and earnestly affirming that it is not only necessary to recognize the validity of the orders of presbyterially ordained ministers in order to the reunion of Christendom, but that the history and polity of the Church of England prove that such a recognition can and ought to be given. Can we not see that, if the Lambeth Conference had accepted the recommendation of their committee, the way would have been opened to treat on a just, yet generous, basis with the great nonepiscopal bodies of Christians? Without such a basis Christian union is impossible. For the mass of those "who profess and call themselves Christians," and who, under God, are doing the greater part of the aggressive work of Christianity in the world, are also sacredly committed to the guardianship of a deposit which they have received from the apostles, namely, a ministry called of the Holy Ghost and lawfully commissioned by the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv, 14). These Christians cannot give over this trust at the instance of a sacerdotalism which is venerable indeed and worthy of respect, but which is not of the essence of Christianity, our Episcopal brethren themselves being judges. For, as that profound scholar and aged and pious divine, Dr. Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews—whom we have just referred to as having long advocated

* Bishop Machray, *Charge*, p. 17.

the union of Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism in Scotland on such a basis as that sketched by the above committee, of which he was a member—says, in commenting on the statement, “We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline,” found in the encyclical letter :

Let us take good heed that we make no mistake as to what our true position really is. If it be such as the report of our Committee on Reunion stated it (and of this, for my own part, I have no doubt whatever), then the *desertion* of it must be laid to the charge, not of those who advocate *pro hac vice* [for this occasion] the suspension of the law of ordination for a sufficient cause, but of those who deny the competency of the Church to make such a suspension. It is they who *innovate* by assigning to our Church a narrower basis than that which was maintained by our great divines, such as Hooker and Bishop Andrewes, Archbishop Bramhall and Bishop Cosin. And let it not be supposed that I quote their names by random. Hooker has said, “There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop” (book vii, chap. xiv, 11). Bishop Andrewes has said, “A man must be blind who does not see churches standing without episcopacy” (*Opusc. Posth.*, p. 191). Archbishop Bramhall has said, “I do not make the way of Episcopal ordination to be simply necessary, but only show what is safest” (vol. iii, p. 475). Bishop Cosin has said, “I love not to be herein more wise or harder than our own Church is, which hath never publicly condemned and pronounced the ordination of the other Reformed Churches to be void” (vol. iv, p. 403). I need not tell you that these witnesses to the doctrine of an Anglican Church are universally admitted to be among the very chiefest of her divines, and that each of them was more or less of the high school.*

The resolutions of the Committee on Church Reunion were of too liberal a nature, however, and their concessions too sweeping, to be adopted by such a careful and conservative body as the Lambeth prelates. Their rejection was due to a variety of reasons. Many of the members shared those stricter views of church order which we have seen set forth by Bishops Doane and Mylne. And these views are held so tenaciously that the adoption of the above resolutions would have precipitated a division in the English Church. This is acknowledged by the writer of the article “Episcopal Comments on the Lambeth Conference” in the *Church Quarterly Review* (London, April, 1889, pp. 23, 24. “Can it be doubted,” he says, “for

* *The Lambeth Conference and Church Reunion*, pp. 21, 22. Edinburgh, 1889.

an instant that a recognition of Presbyterian ordinations, such as is advocated by the Bishop of Sydney, the Bishop of Rupert's Land, and the Bishop of St. Andrew's, would be immediately followed by a violent rupture in the Church itself?" He quotes the Bishop of Edinburgh to the same effect. "It is absurd to urge a scheme of union which . . . if conceivably successful in winning over some from Presbyterianism, would inevitably detach from us a much larger number of our own people and clergy, and possibly drive them either to the Roman communion or to the formation of a separate body. I do not believe in schemes of union that are to be effective at the cost of splitting one of the parties, if not both, from top to bottom." * Besides this, the Anglican Church is trying to establish fraternal relations with the Greek, Old Catholic, and Scandinavian Churches, and the price of this hardly-to-be-won fraternity is the throwing overboard all the Churches of the Reformation and of later times who do not hold to the divine institution of the threefold ministry.

The decisive rejection of the almost unanimous report of the Committee on Church Reunion by the Lambeth Conference reveals two facts: first, there is a large and able body of Episcopal divines who are ready to meet halfway other Christian denominations and to confer as to the healing of the divisions of Protestant Christendom on the only possible basis of the mutual recognition of orders; second, there is a larger and more influential body, who, although sincerely desiring Christian union, are determined that the visible oneness of Christ's body can only come by the way of the "historic episcopate," in the pre-latic sense of those words.

* Bishop Dowden in the *Guardian*, December 5, 1888, quoted in *Church [of England] Quarterly Review*, vol. xxviii, p. 24.

No Aged Sanctus

ART. II. — PANTHEISM'S DESTRUCTION OF BOUNDARIES.—PART I.*

It is not our desire to be classed with those who have no good word for pantheism in any form. The difference between our age and the age which preceded it is too deeply marked for this. Then it was deism, cold and grave; a rationalism which withered the spirit; a conventional affectation on every hand; a state of society such as exists in the waiting-room of the house of one dead, inanimate and weaned from every ideal. In its place we have now an age full of animation and thrift; a boiling and a fermentation of all the elements of society; a spirit to dare everything, together with development of power which is astonishing. Were ours the choice, therefore, between frozen deism, which causes the blood at length to coagulate in the veins, and this melting pantheism, which from the midst of a tropical wealth communicates to the soul a thrill of its own delight, there would be no room for hesitation. In India we should have been Buddhists, and perhaps have approved the Vedas. In China we should have preferred the system of Lao-Tse to that of Confucius, and in Japan we should have turned our back upon the official Shinto, that we might share the hardships of the oppressed priests of Buddha.

For do not forget that the deepest trait of pantheism consists of a false love; a love which, it must be allowed, steps across appointed boundaries, but which, even in this false and unrighteous form, is born, nevertheless, from the motive of love. It repels not, but it attracts. Its purpose is to unite, and not to separate. Call it spiritual adultery, but adultery, nevertheless, born of affectionate inclination, the outcome of homesickness and of the pathos of sympathy. For all pantheism is religious pantheism at first, and only later on is crystallized into a philosophic system; and only by its degenerating effect does it work its prac-

* Copyright, 1893, by J. Hendrik de Vries.

[The above article, although a translation, is of such a quality as to render it desirable for the pages of the *Review*. As is well known, its author is a distinguished leader in the evangelical orthodox movement of the Reformed Church in Holland; and as the article in the original is accessible to but few American readers we have accepted for publication the following admirable translation by the Rev. Mr. de Vries.—ED.]

tical destruction in life. The soul seeks after God; and when the light of revelation is wanting, and he cannot be found by the dusky glimmerings of reason, the soul becomes impetuous with longing and indiscreet even to the borders of the irreverent, and agonizes after God, to enter his presence, to fathom the hidden depths of his being, and rests not until it has lost itself in him or unconsciously made him become manifest in itself. This trait, this motive, is one and the same all the world over; and whether you hear the Hindoo utter his heart-breaking cry after his nirvana; or whether you see the Gnostic delight himself in his syzygies; or Böhme, coloring his pantheism with Christian tints, theosophically; or Madame de Guyon, quietistically; and anon Schelling, in a philosophic style, it is with them all the one strong effort to restrain the soul from its impetuous longings, to lose itself in the depths of the being of God. Let us call it once more a spiritual adultery; but it is the glow of a tragic passion, which is far more attractive and captivating than the cold egotism of the matter-of-fact man, who may not question the existence of God, but has no further dealings with him than *pro memoria*. And also in our age it is noteworthy how the newly aroused Christian religion in Schleiermacher has kissed the hand of pantheism, and how Schelling (provided that the theistic name be retained) has allowed himself deep draughts from the foaming cup of pantheism. True piety shrank back from the rationalistic coldness and from the conventional mechanism of our supranaturalists. But at the hand of Schelling it regains its mysteries, its holy Trinity, its Incarnation, including even the doctrine of the resurrection.

But, however luxuriantly this pantheism grew, like grass in prairie lands, under that grass did hide a poisonous adder. That, which in the tents of the saints received its corrective from piety itself, lost this corrective the moment it began to sparkle from the philosopher's desk; for then philosophic pantheism quickly repressed the religious element. With Hegel every religious motive sank away in dialectics; and after him the spirit of our age captured for itself the magic formula of pantheism, in order that, being freed from God and from every tie established by him, it might melt the world as it found it and cast it into a new form for every man in accordance with the desires of his own heart.

Three motives simultaneously impelled our age in this direction: its overwhelming feeling of power, its exaggerated sense of human excellence, together with its penetration into the riches of nature. In comparison with the age which preceded it this age feels like a Titan, who carries everything on his broad shoulder, storms the heavens, and cannot rest until everything has been put in a new, that is, a modern, form. By this overwhelming feeling of power its sons have been aroused to an impassioned and exaggerated sense of human excellence. In its thought man is both alpha and omega—an anthropotheism, as some have named it; a worship first of the ideal human, and then of self, however cynically deep this brutal self may have sunk below the human; an Ego-theism which extends to its most repulsive consequence. In the intoxication of his passionate self-esteem man cast himself with his exceeding power upon defenseless nature, and he has put it under foot, and ever since has led it about behind the triumphal car of his science and of his materiality. And these three motives taken together, that feeling of infinite power, that sense of self-esteem, and that alliance into which the spirit of man has entered with the spirit of nature, even without the mention of more satanic or lower motives, entirely explain the pantheistic keynote of our age. Hence it was spoken none too boldly when, according to the several sympathies, pantheism was praised as the “favorite system” of our age, or condemned as the “Radikalhæresie” which now lifts its head; or when an English pantheist boastfully asserted that at least ninety out of every hundred scholars of to-day were pantheists, either openly or in secret.

Let no one think, however, that we assert that philosophic pantheism still sways its scepter in the schools of philosophy; for, with Hæley excepted, the opposite rather is true. Hegel has long been dethroned, and with this the luxurious growth of systematic pantheism has come to a standstill. Philosophy beholds her lecture-halls deserted. Her votaries groan on every hand under her *Abgelebtheit*, senility, and spiritual impotence. Since new philosophies appear no more, as Erdmann complains, the market is flooded with “*Philosophie-Geschichte*.” Spencer has already exalted agnosticism into a system. The long-forgotten Herbart is now conceded to

excel Hegel far in wisdom. The Neo-Kantians go back to Kant; a few even to Leibnitz. And, to show how a man of a very unpoetic name may espy the genius of the spirit of poetry, Professor Knauer, of Vienna, proclaims, in flattering terms Robert Hamerling the greatest of all philosophers, by whose hand was placed the keystone in the front of her palace.

But with this the teeth of the "ever-gormandizing, ever-ruminating monster," as Goethe calls pantheism, are not yet broken. When recently, in spite of the interdict of Van Roest, the socialists held their electoral meeting, they placed over their entrance these words of Opzoomer: "Every citizen, as a member of the commonwealth, has a share in sovereignty." Call this an abuse, if you will, of the professorial dictum, but recognize, at least, that such is ever the course of the statement of a principle. It goes out from the desk; but when in the halls of the philosophers it has long been recalled, or weighed and found wanting, it continues many years in the air of the lower spheres, exercises its influence upon the special sciences, predominates in our text-books, takes the premium in our novels, glitters as tinsel in the daily press, vitiates the unction of our poets, colors the tone of conversation by Schlagwörter, and, in the circles of the mediocrity, or of what the Germans call the "Philisterthum," it altogether subverts public opinion. For instance, inspired by Broca and by Von Nägeli, Darwin admitted in the last edition of his *Descent of Man* and *Origin of Species* the insufficiency of his selection theory; but second-hand science, in text-book and public school, has not ceased to honor this defective selection theory as the philosopher's stone.

It means nothing, therefore, that philosophic pantheism lies vanquished at the desk; practically it works its after effects with no less power, both in special studies and real life. A professor who would still indorse the system of Hegel as such would not be abreast of his times, and he would be more sharply hit than Hegel by the irony of the song:

And now he talks of God in us,
Who never is transcendent,
And all his hearers marvel much
That God's a German student.

Or with more fairness, since I myself am a professor, let me turn the laugh on the professorate, by quoting Goethe's well-known witticism from his "Xeniën :"

What do I care for your scoff,
Over the All and the One;
The professor is surely a person,
But God, as surely, is none.

But the deadly effect of this irony does not save us. In the place of one professorial head which is struck off from this monster at the desk, a hundred other heads appear, all equally poisonous, in the lower strata of society. Then we obtain derivative theories, which Marat rightly designates as doubly dangerous, together with their application, in which the principles themselves are passed by, or covered over, or more often not even surmised to exist by those who write, or speak, or act. By way of example recall the enthusiastic worship of progress. However much the onward step has been accelerated there is never a respite, never a rest, but a life without a Sabbath. There is no looking backward upon that which has been done, nor occupancy, much less enjoyment, of that which has been obtained. No new point is reached in the way, but immediately a new start is made from it. It is like the *sausenden Galop* in the "Todtenritt" of Bürger's "Leonore." It is the Wandering Jew this time, because of a passion which absorbs and attracts, and not because of an agony of fear which relentlessly drives on. It goes ever forward and farther, ever hastening on ahead, an Excelsior which may never end. And is the assertion too bold, that, of every thousand who keep pace as well as they can with this hurrying procession, no two discern or surmise the genetical coherence of this feverish progress with the avowed purpose of the pantheistic world? That *πάντα ῥεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει* * is no longer put as a proposition, but taken up as the life motto, until at length the want of an eternal Sabbath is predicated of God himself, and he, too, as Schüler wittily remarked, has been charmed into "a veritable God of progress."

But enough of this. We were not to treat of Pantheism in general, but merely one of its effects. Therefore we will not even sketch hastily this grasp-elusive Protens, but focus all our

* Everything is in process of becoming, but nothing is.

powers on this one point—that pantheism effaces distinctions, obscures boundary lines, and betrays the tendency to wipe out every antithesis. This tendency derives its impulse from the pantheistic principle itself. This is shown by religious pantheism, which, afraid of a God “afar off,” has no peace even with God “at hand,” but in the prayer-mystery here seeks to penetrate the being of God, and, in the hereafter, yearns after identification with the divine Being, until at length every boundary between God and the soul is lost. The same is true of practical pantheism, which restlessly seeks to equalize all things; and, as long as there is any upward growth, is bent, first upon tying down, then upon curtailing and cutting off, until, finally, every distinction between the cedar and the hyssop ceases to exist. But this is most clearly demonstrated by philosophical pantheism, which systematically fuses every thesis and antithesis into a synthesis, and, by the tempting notion of identity, explains everything which seems dissimilar as similar and, in the end, as being of like essence.

Herein lies the explanation: This philosophy does not deal with reality, but with the image which it saw reflected in the mirror of its thought, or which, more correctly, it formed for itself. Kant struck a blow for this in proclaiming that reality escapes us, and that the form, at least, and the dimension of that which we observe have their rise in us. Then came Fichte, who thought it better not to reckon with that which escapes us, and declared that that which seemed the image had been imagined by ourselves, and hence was the only real. And finally Hegel transposed everything which existed into a purely logical formula, and, after the object had been destroyed together with its image, asserted that the idea alone remained. In this wise this philosophy, with ever greater necessity of consequence, transports us from the real, living world into an abstract world of thought; and in this world, of course, it has free play with every distinction and antithesis. For then we deal no longer with living persons, but with heads sketched by ourselves; and from these crayon-sketches all sorts of lines and wrinkles may be effaced and charmed away as by magic, which from the living face will nevermore depart.

And if pantheism in this wise creates for itself the possibility of escape from the dilemma of distinctions which really exist,

then the very law of thought compels it to use this possibility with ever greater prodigality. Our thinking occasions the arrangement in a fixed order of the phenomena we observe. Thought, from its very nature, demands system. He who thinks looks for general principles in particulars, in order to explain particulars by general principles. Every dualism antagonizes the processes of thought, and thought can rest upon its laurels only when everything has been grouped under one idea. If now we deal with reality and render homage to its law of existence, then with our mode of thinking we are repulsed, stroke upon stroke, by that which obstinately resists our generalization. But if we live as the pantheist lives, not in the real world, but in a gallery of portraits which we ourselves have painted, then of course there is no opposition; then we tolerate no obstinate resistance from our brush and erase all lines which, as they were drawn, do not fit into our system.

Pardon this somewhat dry demonstration. It was needed to show the inner motive as one of sheer necessity, which compels pantheism everywhere to wipe out boundary lines. Declension and conjugation forms may remain, according to Spinoza's figure in grammar, which differ in time and in mood, in person and in case; but all these forms are simple modifications of the primitive word, which always remains the same. Or, as it is expressed by a German philosopher:

All that appears to our eyes as difference and distinction, however much our consciousness insists upon nonidentity, is nevertheless in essence one and the same; it is but the presentation, the formation, the characterization, the development, alteration, expression, revelation, or form of the single substance which alone exists.

This becomes manifest at once in the relation which is thought to exist between God and the world. For centuries the Church of Christ has guarded its barrier against every open or crypto-pantheism by the solemn confession in the inaugural of its Articles of Faith: "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth;" and, in the third century, justly denounced the first weakening of the creation idea, together with the first effort to make the world co-eternal by putting Origen under her ban. The most distinctly

marked boundary line lies between God and the world; and with the taking away of this line all other boundaries are blurred into mere shadows. For every distinction made in our consciousness—aye, the very faculty itself of our consciousness to make distinctions—takes root at last in this primordial antithesis. Think it away, and it becomes night, in whose shadowy darkness everything in our horizon dissolves in a somber gray. But every pantheist starts out with the denial of this primordial antithesis, which is mother to every antithesis among creatures. The pantheist stands ready, the moment we open our Bible, to invalidate the solemn inaugural of Genesis. No, not “in the beginning,” he says, for there was no beginning; not “created,” for the world is eternal; and not “the heaven and the earth,” for the beyond is a mere dream. In this way the three most deeply marked lines of our distinction are wiped out with a single stroke, and every boundary is taken away between God and the world, between time and eternity, between the here and the hereafter. And yet, pantheism must needs begin with the revocation of these antitheses. It can do no other. As far as history extends our thinking travels along a smooth path, but stops at the point where history began, as well as at the point where history ends. There it finds before and behind it a bottomless abyss, over which it dares not leap, and which is much less to be spanned by a bridge; and hence it must, at any price, cipher away both that end and that beginning. For the pantheist there is no existence of God and the world thinkable as two individual substances.

Objection may be made by reminding us of what we stated above, namely, that it is another wind which blows in the higher circles of science; that in those better circles pantheism, together with materialism, has long since been shown the door; and while the *non liquet* is freely expressed concerning the origin, basis, and end of things, there is general content to inquire more carefully into the phenomena of the natural and the spiritual world, and to live on poetry for the heart. And this is so. But has the principle of evolution, or the *Descendenztheorie*, as the Germans call it, therefore ceased to be the *Credo* of the science of our day? And what is this evolution theory other than the application of the pantheistic process to the empiric investigation of phenomena? Here, also, the “*natura*

saltus non facit”—“nature takes no leap”—is motto. Here, also, everything that appears is explained by a preceding appearance. And here, also, both with spiritual and natural phenomena, are denied all real differences of kind, together with independence of origin, and every deeper distinction of being, in either sphere by itself, as well as between the two spheres mutually; and hence, as a matter of fact, every line which marks a boundary is wiped out, and every boundary post which divides the jurisdiction is leveled to the ground. Von Hartman did not exaggerate when he said that “for our times the Descendenz-theorie is unconditionally correct, and is steadily gaining ground amid the spiritual tempest;” or, as an English writer expressed it, “Science amongst us is at its highest when it interprets all orders of phenomena as differently conditioned modes of one kind of uniformity.” Though Darwin himself conceded that his selection theory was insufficient to explain the morphological differences of species, the evolution theory was therefore not dismissed. That which was explained by Darwin mechanically could likewise be interpreted dynamically, and even if need be teleologically, as a spontaneous process in the cosmos which received its impulse from the first germ, whose motive starts from the teleological idea which dominates the entire process. One may therefore be a Darwinist, and with Darwin bend the knee reverently before a “God,” for surely God created this “force” which potentially included the entire cosmos within itself; or it was he who determined for the cosmos the aim of its development process. This system is so pliable that more than one Herbartian, in spite of his own principle, is found to side with Darwinism.

This would not be difficult to understand if Darwin, with the help of the fossil discoveries, had succeeded in laying before us the steps of transition in specimens from the plant to man, all which would fit into each other as links of a chain. But this is not so. And it is not merely the search after the missing link; but even if we go back a period of three hundred thousand years, for which it is claimed there is certain proof, traces of species are found in the fossil world which are now extinct, and also deviating forms. But the skeletons of the still existing species are strikingly analogous to the skeletons of our animals. In simple honesty, therefore, Darwin acknowledges that the

proof is far from complete, that it is still incomplete in the domain of nature; and let us add that for spiritual purposes it finds no support for a single point. But says he repeatedly, "This, therefore, shakes not my faith in the evolution theory." It follows, therefore, that we are not dealing with a compulsory theorem, which has been conclusively demonstrated, but with an hypothesis which is supported by a most defective induction, whose general applause takes root not in incontestable facts, and much less in complete proof, but in a general mood of spirits; since Darwin's theory places before our learned and civilized public a solution of the world problem which responds to its most secret sympathies. And if it is known that the keynote of our age is pantheistic, and that in the evolution theory there appears one of the richest thoughts of pantheism, namely, that of the ever-continuing process, in its most attractive form, is then the assertion too bold, that in the Descendenz-theorie is found, as its chief motive, the impulsive force of pantheism?

Or, to probe the real motive deeper still, in the evolution theory, even as in pantheism, hides the desire of the human heart to rid itself of God. In spite of his *practische Vernunft* it was this desire which actuated Kant, of whom Baader correctly wrote: "The fundamental error of his philosophy is that man is autonomous and spontaneous, as if he possessed reason of himself; for it transforms man to a god, and so becomes pantheistic." And Feuerbach uttered merely the consequence of this system when he said, "God was my first thought, reason my second, and man my third and last thought. The subject of the Godhead is reason, but the subject of the reason is man;" and by these words he likewise expressed the deepest thought of our age. Buchner, himself an avowed atheist, frankly declares that, even more than that of Lamarck, Darwin's theory is purely atheistic; and we heartily agree with this opinion. For what advantage is it that we trace the course of the law of causality without a break back to the first gaseous nebula and cell or germ, when behind this cell or germ the inexplicable act of a creative God still demands our recognition, and with all our thinking we strike upon the very rock to evade which the whole theory was invented? If it be true, therefore, that the *Moses der modernen Freigeister*, as Feuerbach calls Spinoza, has not led us into the promised land of

35—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. IX.

philosophic rest, and that the failure of pantheistic philosophy can no longer be concealed, it is still in the evolution theory that the harmful impulse of pantheism works in the most seductive manner, since it spends all its power to maintain the nonexistence of separating boundaries in every department of our knowledge. Valentinus, the most sensible of Gnostics, relegated evolution back of the creation to the *βύθος* (the deep), but was so much aware of the danger for the erasure of boundaries which concealed itself in this that out of the *Ἀντοπάτωρ* he makes suddenly a God to appear in the form of the Horos, or Horkos, that is, the boundary for the maintenance of the fixed order of all that exists. This thought, however strange its form, is nevertheless entirely correct as a poetic image. Faith in the living God stands or falls with the maintenance or removal of boundaries. God created the boundaries. He himself is the chief boundary for all his creatures, and the effacement of boundaries is virtually identical with the obliteration of the idea of God. If, then, it be never so true that modern philosophy "began with doubt and ended with despair" this whole pantheistic stream has left a poisonous slime upon the shore, and it is in Darwin's evolution theory that this slime reveals its power.

It may truly be said that with all differences of opinion this evolution theory is the "formula of unity," which at present unites all priests of modern science in their secularized temple. A few dreamers may utter complaints against this, but they are aged manikins, who, as described by Hartman, "feel themselves incapable of a second education, but whose numbers have so long been diminishing that they are powerless to stop the victor's march of the new truth." This evolution theory has become the fashion-system, not merely with the Darwins and Haeckels, the Spencers and the Nägelis, but equally so with our theologians, with our psychologists and moralists. Even an adherent of Lotze, my learned colleague Dr. De la Saussaye, of the city university, wrote only recently: "Nowhere is a definite frontier between the domains of nature and of spirit clearly demonstrable, nor may an unmixed expression be predicated of either sphere."

But we are most concerned about the favor with which this critical theory gains among our jurists (the divinely appointed

watchers of the boundary of the "Mount"), as is shown by the example of the late Ihering. We are second to none in warm admiration of his talents; but it may not be concealed that Ihering was an evolutionist. Being himself no natural philosopher, he withholds an opinion on Darwinism, but definitely declares "that the result which he has reached in his studies of law establishes it most firmly in my profession." The "sense of right has grown with him to be eternal, since everything which comes into being is devoted to destruction." And this eternal process is continued of necessity by evolution, which evolution begins in the brute creation; for, writes he, "By the same necessity under which, according to Darwin's theory, one species develops itself from another does the one end of justice find its origin in another," and then adds, in an altogether pantheistic sense, "Right knows as little of a break as nature; that which goes before must first exist, before that which is higher, of course by evolution, can follow after."

He does not deny, therefore, the existence of God. In his preface he even derives the "purpose" which explains to him everything from a conscious God. But with him, as with all evolutionary theists, this is none other to him than an *æ* for this, to him, unknown greatness, of whose authority he rids himself in every concrete case. According to Ihering, the sense of right is not innate, but only "begotten in us" by the evolution of right. Christian ethics, which still holds to eternal principles, he condemns because of this clinging to the absolute; and when rightly he protests against the separation which snatches right from its moral basis, and traces for himself the origin of moral life, he represents this moral life as produced by the "purpose," which is again the process of endless generation. When the question is put, "Who is the subject of this purpose, who ordains it and renders it real?" then theism is again abandoned, and he affirms that "God is not the final purpose of morality; the end and purpose of ethics is society." Whether or not God is still spoken of in the Gnostic sense as "a final end of morality," with this interpretation the Christian ground is entirely deserted. The fulfillment of man's being is looked for in "self becoming one's own end," and whatever has the insolence to attack him in the holy temple of that ideal is treated with contempt. Faith is put in Michael Kohlhaas, who, in Von Kleist's

novel, draws the sword against society. And when we are taught, "Rather suffer wrong," and Christ exclaims in his Sermon on the Mount, "If any man take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also," Thering rejects this as apathy, which betrays how blunt and weak the sense of right has grown; and he provokes strife among the citizens by exhorting them never to suffer anything in private life to go unpunished. Hence, if his theory triumphs, not merely our Christian, but even Herbert's system, which in a more Christian way makes right to be born from the æsthetic thirst after peace, must pass under the juridical ban. For then it will not be, "Blessed are the peace makers," but "Blessed every one who as a fighting-cock flies in a passion for his right." And when an heros like Thering teaches thus, what may be looked for at the hands of lesser gods?

To show to what extent the influence of this pantheistic tendency and of the evolution theory which has become its *Credo* has effaced, one by one, all formerly recognized boundaries, must we thread our way across the entire domain of cosmic phenomena and the still broader field of sciences? This is not necessary. Here also "the lion may be known by its claws." And it is quite sufficient for the question in hand that the chief boundary lines which have become blurred be noted, and that as theologians we halt a little longer at the boundary removal on theologic grounds. Now, the blurring of boundaries begins of necessity in our senses and ideas. Real boundaries, such as exist, for instance, between man and woman, are not to be wiped out. It is as true of philosophy as of the English Parliament that "it can do everything except making a man a woman." And though a brilliant scholar, whose oratory has more than once delighted us, once stoutly prophesied that, like the diabolic love of unnature, so also the divinely innate love between man and woman shall extinguish its torch, we venture to deny that among our own contemporaries, or yet among the younger generation, we have ever discovered the slightest decrease of this natural love. No, the boundaries which, independent of our thought, exist in real life, are immovable. Water is never reconcilable with fire. Hence an erasure of boundaries can be spoken of only in our representation, in our senses and ideas; and of these ideas Thilo complains none too strongly that "Finally, all concepts lose themselves in each other amid

the one great tangle of the absolute Ego." This was not done all at once. The very majesty of logic, with its unchangeable laws of thought, stood in the way of this amalgamation; hence, violence had to be done to the logical boundaries first, before the other boundaries could successfully be blurred. Thus the unhappy process began. Hegel clearly saw that his identity system would not do for common logic, and therefore did not shrink from attacking logic itself by cutting the sinews of the *principium exclusi tertii medii*. Thus only did he clear the course for his cavalcade of identical ideas. And then he let them file before his thinking spirit two by two and arm in arm—the something with the nothing, the here with the yonder, the finite with the infinite, the ideal with the real, the being with the thinking, the object with the subject, the different with the nondifferent, liberty with necessity, the imaginary light with the imaginary darkness.

And of course he did not stop short with abstractions. His object and that of all his followers was the application to life of the identity idea. Then it became a serious matter. For the boundary between God and the world also fell away, which boundary, according to the formula of old Hellas, may possibly refer to a distinction in thought, but never to a distinction in time or in essence. According to Dr. Mayer's formula, God was "reduced to a world-power," and, worse still, his conscious life dissolved in our human life. In this wise the boundary between God and man was taken away, with the preponderance on the human side. The boundary between man and man must needs follow. We rise as ocean waves and disappear among its waters. We bud as leaves on the tree, that in withering we may give place to the new leaf in spring, which interprets Homer's line, "The wind pours the leaves to the ground," essentially, and not chronologically.

The spiritual boundaries came next. Between our physical and psychical life also every boundary had to fall away. Truth was given in marriage to error. Hirner even boasted of the "Heroism of the Lie." Good and evil, also, and sin and holiness, were to reconcile their hatred. What is good? "Each one is only what he can be." Nero and Jesus are merely different manifestations of one and the same divine impulsive power. The ancient Parsees were no fools when, next to Ormuzd, they

rendered divine homage to Ahriman and his Dévs, because, forsooth, what we call Satan is but another name for the Holy One of Israel. And, when we find in society much that is noble and much that we dislike, the old figure of Böhme declares that in our own organism likewise there is much that is noble in the brain and much in the entrails to rouse our dislike, but that without the entrails these brains could not exist.

In this wise the blurring of boundaries is restlessly continued, not merely in the identification of force and matter, but practically by identifying power and right; by dissolving responsibility into a pitiable atavism; by confusing property and theft, by weakening the antithesis between the authorities and the subject, making both divisors of the one idea of State. In this State, which provides for every want, as Rothe wills it, the Church of Christ also must disappear. The love for native land must give way to cosmopolitan preference. No difference is countenanced between city and village—only communities are known; and no difference is longer tolerated among classes of society, in modes of living or national dress. Uniformity is the curse which our modern life willfully feeds upon. In music Beethoven was the first to grasp this pantheistic tendency of our age, and to voice it for thousands upon thousands of hearts by his C minor and Ninth Symphonies; and after him Wagner has willfully broken down the boundary between the worlds of sound and of thought. Certain stylists incline more and more to confuse the inkpot with the pallet. Yes, there has been formed a circle which would be glad to have the boundary removed between language and language, and which would think the world idealized if it were peopled with fourteen hundred millions, who, from the North to the South Pole, spake none other than one holy Volapük.

But enough. We made no mention of the theory which makes man descend from the chimpanzee, simply because this theme—pardon the term—is too threadbare. Only it is worthy of note that the *N. R. Courant* recently announced that in our zoological garden the orang-outang was not dead but *deceased*; also that the vocabulary of the monkey language now numbers four words, clearly understood by means of a phonograph, which disarms Max Müller, who still thinks language the boundary line drawn between man and animal. But we need say no

more on this. For all this theory really asserts is that everything is allied, and whether a stone drops, or rain clatters, or the lark flaps his wings and sings his morning song, or man thinks, composes poetry, and kneels in prayer, it is all one life-utterance, altogether an excitement of feeling and a spontaneous life-utterance of the unknown absolute Spirit.

But the religious interests briefly claim our attention, for with these entered the strongest motive for boundary removals. Our Christian religion drew a new and very deep boundary line between the profane and the sacred, which was rejected by the secularizing spirit almost with insults and sneers. There was no longer room for theology as a science; her metaphysic was identical with philosophy, and, for the rest, was lost in literary, historical, and ethnological studies. The boundary between God and idols fell of itself away, since animism and fetichism were classed with our Christian religion under one head. In this organic connection the origin, essence, and idea of religion could be known from religious phenomena, and in this way arose the newborn "science of religion," which more and more supplants theology. The knowledge of the object of religion is no more cared for, but merely the knowledge of the sensations, representations, and utterances to which religious feeling moves the subject. With this every leading difference in religion fell away, and every boundary between heresy and doctrine; and that which moved the spirits in the world estranged from Christ, was bound, as some affirm, to work its effect in the Church also with utmost pliancy. And then—O, why not otherwise?—the "Vermittelungs-theologen," so attractive in other ways, have in Schleiermacher's track sought salvation in their ethical, theosophical, and apocalyptic diversification—in that unhappy *Vermittelung* by which in advance the opponent gained the day. We do not say this because we do not appreciate their labors, so brilliant in many respects, or because we do not understand the goodness of their intention, and much less from a desire to offend any of them personally, but because their position was simply untenable. They were *pot de terre*, and proposed a walk with *pot de fer*; and they did not win the spirit of the times for Christ, but the spirit of the times estranged them more and more from confessing Christianity.

Schleiermacher was pantheist and subjectivist. He brought religious pantheism with him from the circles of the Moravians and found philosophic pantheism in Germany's universities of his day. This was at once manifested in his proposition that God is not thinkable without the world, which proposition was defended among us, as Professor Bavinek correctly showed, by the late Professor De la Saussaye, of Groningen; and every invention by the Martensens, the Rothses, the Keerls, and the Hoffmans, in Germany, to remove the ancient landmarks from the domain of the Christian religion, has been echoed from our pulpits ever since and reprinted by our press. By the conversion of truth into ethics the boundary fell which separates moral life from the life of thought, and presently dogmatics had to surrender its birth-right to the "description of moral life." A "Union Church" without confessional discipline became the ideal also among us. To be equally stern with the Calvinist and sympathetic with the rationalist became indicative of a higher life; and by degrees there stole in all manner of strange doctrine. Christ would have come in the world even had sin never entered, for Christ was the natural ideal toward which the progress of the human race was directed. In Christ the Son of God was not incarnate, but human nature had reached in him a higher, divine-human character. As a human being Jesus could not have been mere man, and in this way was renewed the legend of the Androgyne. Soul and body were no longer two, but lost in the mingling of the *Geistleibliche*. The mystery of the Trinity was applauded, but recast as by charm in the sense of the newer philosophy. The atonement consisted not in the dying of the Lamb of God for our sin, but in the appearance upon the tree of our race of its ideal branch. The Holy Scriptures are no longer the product of a positive revelation, but the fruit of Israel's organic development, under higher influences, in connection, therefore, with whatever was imparted to other nations. Justification by faith became lost nearly altogether in the nursing process of a heavenly holiness. Even the absolute boundary between this and the coming life was taken away. Conversion may occur after death; and there have been theologians among these who preached the continuance, on the other side of the grave, of a sacramental Church.

destined yonder to complete the holiness process which here remains unfinished.

That which stares us in the face in all these parts is the effect of what Schleiermacher spun, and of what Schelling, more dangerously, embroidered with the glittering thread of gold. It is the recasting of forms, the wiping out of lines, and fitting out the Christian essence in a modern philosophic garb. And by doing this truth was lost, not merely that objective truth which stands graven in the tables of our confession, but that inward truth by which this confession meets with the response of "Amen" from our heart. It all became a confusion of tongues, one chaos of floating mists. And then Schelling completed in these men what Kant had begun with his "*statutarische Religion*," by inspiring them, as Scholtin expressed it, with the art of proclaiming "new and strange ideas in ecclesiastical terms as the decisions of ancient orthodoxy." And let us grant that they jumped after the drowning man in the philosophic stream to save him; but the tragic fate overtook them of being dragged down to the deep by him whom they tried to save.

We do not idealize Ritschl, but after all the chaotic would-be theology there is relief in the clearness of his thought. Of him it is known, at least, that he has broken with the old metaphysics. But with Ritschl we wander still further off. No single boundary in religion is left unweakened or unwarped to mark the ancient track. Piety is still demanded, but it must be altogether gratuitous, spontaneous, such as in the end is also thought to be found in animals. Some scholars claim to have discovered in our house-dogs real traces of religion, as first beginnings of "piety," which idea is so grotesque that involuntarily it raises the question whether it is likewise agreed to class them with polytheists or monotheists. For an answer to which (since, with Islam excepted, monogamy prefers to be classed with monotheism) some clown may point us to the analogy of their lower love; for the evolution from polygamy to monogamy has not been attained by our poodles and our dogs.

A. Kueper

ART. III.—SHELLEY'S REVOLUTIONARY IDEAL AND ITS INFLUENCE ON HIS POETRY.

IN dealing with Shelley's attitude toward the revolutionary movement in society and thought that had its origin at the close of the last century it is not our purpose to dwell upon his mad revolt against the existing order of things, but rather to point out and define that ideal which held out to him certain wild-eyed hopes and to trace its influence over his poetic life. The mad, disordered notions of "Queen Mab," "The Revolt of Islam," and others of his earlier poems really held no permanent place in the Shelleyan philosophy of the revolution. They were mere gases thrown off from the alembic of Shelley's heart before the genuine spirits could be distilled. A shy, sensitive soul, surrounded in earliest boyhood by people who had not the fineness of perception and delicacy of sympathy necessary to understand him; later on, stung by the insulting coldness of mocking companions and goaded into passionate fury by their taunts—he naturally grew more and more isolated, and developed in the end an abnormal temperament, a combination of lonely pride in his own thoughts and determined hatred for the tyranny to which he was subjected. Lacking the advice of wise and sympathetic friends, he turned in mad revolt against the oppression by schoolmaster and schoolmate that so marked the life of younger boys at Sion House and Eton a hundred years ago. At the same time, driven in upon himself in strange ways—for his fancy was strong and wild—he strove to know the hidden mysteries of life and nature, until at length one "fresh May-dawn," while musing deeply on the lot of life, the shadow fell from nature and he wept with tears of ecstasy. Then, fired by love—for "love and life in him were twins, born at one birth"—and smitten by the sound of school-room voices that seemed but echoes of the strife of tyrants and foes, he vowed ever to be "wise and just and free and mild," if such power lay in him. In this resolution lies the germ of Shelley's philosophy and life.

But this happy attitude of calm and just wisdom was disturbed even before the boy grew into manhood, while the love and the hopes which that love engendered became shadowed

for a time in the madness of iconoclastic fury. It was the old struggle between good and evil which played itself out in Shelley's early life, the principle of love waging at times a doubtful contest with the principle of rebellion. Under the strong compulsion of Godwin's doctrines the revolt against Etonian society was transformed into a revolt against Church and State—a tyranny as hateful as that of the schoolroom; and by the reading of *Political Justice* were excited hopes of final human perfectibility which seemed to him attainable only through the absolute overthrow of society and religion. Statecraft and commerce, the brood of selfishness and custom which perverts man's nature; power, which, like a desolating pestilence, pollutes whatever it touches; Jehovah, in whose name wars have been waged and murders innumerable have been committed, who is represented as delighting himself in the infliction of pain and the satisfying of revenge; religion, which he regarded as a fiend, peopling earth with demons, hell with men, and heaven with slaves—these the young defender of his faith felt that he must fight and slay. And no feathery lance was hurled by the wild enthusiast. Boldly avowing his belief in theories that men despise, he attacked the very institutions they hold dear, and brought down upon his head the persecutions of indignant moralists. To this violent iconoclasm was he driven, then, by that principle of rebellion, victorious for the moment over the principle of love. The trouble was that Shelley was an enthusiast. When first the divine afflatus of liberty and love breathed on him he was, like the strayed reveler, drunk with the wine of Circe; nor paused he to survey his ground or understand himself.

And yet, mistaken as was, for example, his conception of the spirit of Christianity, did not that conception have its origin in certain misunderstandings of the history of the faith? It cannot be denied that the various interpretations of the truth of the Gospel have awakened strife and caused even bloodshed; nor can it be doubted that in certain of its doctrines, as once accepted and taught, Christianity fairly allows the inference that the God worshiped is a God to whom vengeance is sweet. Shelley's mistake lay in judging Christianity by its manifest perversions and in allowing his eyes to be blinded as to its essential spirit. Similarly, in

certain other of his theories he disregarded the intent of the doctrines which he opposed. Moreover, some of his positive ideas are nearly related to those which Jesus came to teach. He held high ethical conceptions of man's relation to his neighbor; he sought to establish a divorce of punishment from revenge—a divorce which is happily reaching consummation in our own day—and in all ways taught the spirit of Christ's admonition that we love one another. It is, however, not our purpose to excuse Shelley's errors or to extenuate them; we desire only to bear in mind, lest we be tempted harshly to misjudge him, that these errors are accidents rather than essential elements of his philosophy, and that the circumstances of his earlier life were poisons which it would have required exceptionally strong antidotes to antagonize. Had Shelley been given wise advisers during that early period these accidents would have been fewer and the essence purer and sweeter. But Godwin was too philosophic to cool the ardor of the boy whose blood had been fired by his *Political Justice*; and Timothy Shelley was too much of an English squire to control an Ariel. The extravagances of genius must be restrained "in leashes like starbeams, soft yet strong."

This madness having gradually spent itself in the earlier revolutionary poems, especially in "Queen Mab" and "The Revolt of Islam," as well as in certain wild and altogether futile attempts at the amelioration of mankind, particularly in Ireland, the poet's mind settled down after a while into a joyous yet calm and seldom-wavering hope of the final salvation of the race through the power of love. We must not, however, think of this change as being brought about suddenly; rather we must regard it as a slow and almost imperceptible growth which only began to reach its culmination about the time of Shelley's retirement to Italy in 1818. That propagandist mission to Dublin, undertaken in the interests of Irish liberty—an escapade from which Godwin vainly strove to dissuade his young disciple—preceded by a year the publication of "Queen Mab," the most violent and revolutionary of all Shelley's poems. This was printed in 1813, and was followed four years later by "The Revolt of Islam," a poem which Shelley regarded at the time of its composition as a prophecy falling from dying lips, which was consequently to embody for all time a complete expression

of its author's faiths and hopes. Shocking as it is in many of its teachings, in its disregard of the facts of history and of the value of historical institutions, in its glorification of forbidden love, in its contempt for political and religious standards as the product of selfish ingenuity, it is yet wanting in much of that furious, destructive, revolutionary color which is so conspicuous in its predecessor. Constructive it is, rather, presenting a true and noble idea of all revolution, a broad, national, or universal movement, drawing its inspiration from definite moral principles, tempering justice with charity, quiet, bloodless in its progress, peaceful and irresistible as a river, and working itself out to fulfillment in the hearts of men, not by might nor by power, but by the spirit.

Side by side with those revolutionary poems were produced others entirely different in tone and treatment, developing in all its purity the ideal of love, but in no way the antagonistic principles of rebellion. Such was the poem "Alastor," written at Bishopgate in the autumn of 1815, at the close of a boating trip up the Thames; such was the fragment "Prince Athanase," which belongs to those Marlow times when river and inlet yielded the glowing visions of the "golden city;" while the eclogue, "Rosalind and Helen," partly composed in this same summer of 1817, but completed in Italy the following year, shows a curious blending of the two streams. In this poem we have almost the final ebullition of destructive revolution; for the great body of Shelley's poetry, from 1818 until the waters of the Mediterranean closed over him, is devoted to a presentation and delineation of that ideal of love and its consequent hopes which we have already referred. And it is in this ideal, which endured to the end, that we must look for the essence of Shelley's revolutionary philosophy, not in the transitory and early-dying insanity of his first enthusiasm for liberty and love. Turning aside, then, from such accidental aspects of the Shelleyan faith, we desire to examine this essential ideal of his belief, see what is its nature, trace incidentally its growth, notice those exultant hopes to which it gave a being, and show its influence on the tone and texture of Shelley's song.

First, if we consider the distinctive temper of the characters to whom this ideal, as the poet conceived it, was revealed, we shall catch thereby a reflex of the quality and essence of the

ideal itself. Even in "Queen Mab," where madness colored the entire poem and the accidents of its author's faith predominated, we shall find foreshadowings of that which grew and developed until it became the actuating motive of all his poetic conceptions. The ideal is there, vague and misty, felt rather than seen, but still there and visible if we search for it; and, disclosing itself to the unsphered soul of Ianthe, it teaches her to love. Amid the wilderness of worlds, at the immensity of which even the soaring fancy staggers, she finds as a brooding presence the spirit of nature, with which the lightest leaf that quivers to the passing breeze is likewise instinct; and by this spirit she is taught that

Were it virtue's only need to dwell
In a celestial palace, all resigned
To pleasurable impulses, immured
Within the prison of itself, the will
Of changeless Nature would be unfulfilled.

In "Alastor" the ideal is less obscured by the vapors of violent revolt, and its effect upon the soul to whom it is revealed is more apparent. Alastor, "a youth of uncorrupted feelings and adventurous genius," is "led forth, by an imagination inflamed and purified through familiarity with all that is excellent and majestic, to the contemplation of the universe." Like Ianthe, he was wise;

The fountains of divine philosophy
Fled not his thirsting lips; and all of great
Or good or lovely, which the sacred past
In truth or fable consecrates, he felt
And knew.

Joyous, tranquil, self-possessed, he follows nature's most secret steps and drinks in the beauty and magnificence of the external world, until he, like Ianthe, is suddenly seized with a discontent in selfish pleasure and a thirst for intercourse with an intellectual being like himself. As he wanders alone among the mountains and wilds of Asia there comes to him in vision a veiled maiden whose voice "was like the voice of his own soul, heard in the calm of thought." Endowed with "all of wonderful or wise or beautiful which the poet, the philosopher, or the lover could depicture," she sings to him of knowledge, truth, virtue, and the "lofty hopes of divine liberty," until in an

ecstasy of love he throws himself in her dissolving arms. Night comes and swallows up the vision; in the cold white light of morning she is gone—lost forever “in the wide pathless desert of dim sleep.” Driven by the memory of that lovely dream, he rushes through dreary chasms and over tempestuous seas in search of her, but dies at length in a rocky twilight dell far above the clouds without ever again catching a glimpse of her ideal form.

Prince Athanase, too, is a youth whose heart could understand no ill, but felt only pity and wild sorrow for it. Schooled by the aged Zonoras, his soul had wedded wisdom, but, like Ianthe's and Alastor's, found no permanent satisfaction in merely selfish knowledge. Longing for companionship with a fair soul, he, as Alastor before him, sought one whom he might love—or at least would have done so, Mrs. Shelley tells us, had the fragment been completed. At length he found a lady whom he took to be Urania, the heavenly love. But alas! he is deceived; she disappoints him and proves to be a vile Pandemos. Pining away and dying in his disappointment, he, more fortunate than Alastor, is permitted at the last moment to rest his eyes on the radiant Aphrodite.

In “Rosalind and Helen” Lionel exhibits the same traits to be found in the other souls to whom the ideal is disclosed. He, though of great wealth and noble lineage, felt the thrill of liberty, and was filled, not with love, for he already loved all humanity, but with “faith and hope and courage, mute in death.” Thus inspired, he went among men and pleaded with eloquence so strong that tyranny grew dumb before him. But when there came a change, and men were again trampled under foot by despotism, Lionel, goaded by the misery of ruined hopes, withdrew to distant lands, where he, too, sought one to love; and he, like Athanase, was deceived by a mocking Pandemos. Broken in health and spirits, he came home, to be wooed back to life and health by the love of one who was in truth a heavenly spouse. And they two lived together, married not by the rites of Church or man, but by their love, until his foes, who claimed that he had uttered blasphemy against their gods, dragged him away and chained him in a cell. His mute smile in suffering melted even the jailer to gentleness, and when he tottered forth many wept to see his pitiful face. He came out

to die, and on a quiet evening, leaning on the breast of the pure Uranian love, he passed away.

To know, to love, to find in love the completion of wisdom, is the lesson taught by the heroes of Shelley's creation. We desire, however, to note their intense hopefulness; they never despair of the final accomplishment of their desires. Queen Mab dismisses Ianthe with a glowing prophecy of the dawn of love and an assurance that all things

Tend to perfect happiness, and urge
The re-tless wheels of being on their way,
Whose flashing spokes, instinct with infinite life,
Bicker and burn to gain their destined goal.

Alastor, "obedient to the light that shone within his soul," pursued his quest unfaltering even to the death. The same hope-winged Athanase until in the ecstasy of attainment he cried,

Thou art the wine, whose drunkenness is all
We can desire, O Love!

It thrilled the dying pulse of Lionel when he listened to the strains of the nightingale as daylight lingered gray on the last clouds of evening, and

His countenance,
Raised upward, burned with radiance
Of spirit-piercing joy.

In knowledge, hope, and love, then, may be found those graces which distinguish from common humanity the souls of them to whom the supreme ideal has revealed itself.

By reflexes and shadowings from these sweet spirits we have been able to catch somewhat of the nature and quality of the ideal itself. Impalpable, intangible, not of the earth earthly, but of the spirit spiritual, it is in essence a ruling principle conforming the hearts of men to a love that knows no hate. But let us show more clearly what the ideal is by showing more fully its dwelling place and its peculiar and inner features. Ianthe's soul, it will be remembered, found, dwelling in the immeasurable distances of the sky and moving in each blade and leaf, a nature-spirit. The poet found it, likewise, amid the awful solitudes of Mont Blanc and in

The bubbles which the enchantment of the sun
Sucks from the pale, faint water—flowers, that pave
The cozy bottom of clear lakes and pools.

He felt the surpassing power of this nature-spirit, and discovered in it one whose

Light alone—like mists o'er mountains driven,
Or music by the night wind sent
Through strings of some lone instrument,
Or moonlight on a midnight stream—
Gives grace and truth to life's unquiet dream.

And it is this spirit, so immaterial and quintessent that it is but "felt like an odor within the sense"—call it beauty or nature, or what we will—which bound the boy and the man to love all human kind. For this spirit is love. It is this which Alastor sought, which Athanase found. It invests ocean with its radiance; it fills the heavens with their depths of blue; it imbues the deserts and mountains of earth until they wear "beauty like some bright robe;" it soars among men,

And, as soft air
In spring, which moves the unwakened forest,
Clothing with leaves its branches bare and bleak,

constrains them to gentleness of heart. Is this portrait indefinite and shadowy? It cannot but be so. The ideal itself is too immaterial and elusive to be imprisoned in human words or stayed even by the bars of human conceptions. It can be only mirrored to the imagination darkly through the tender and unsatisfying words of sensuous excitement, through the dreams that haunt "the wide pathless desert of dim sleep," through the remembered odors of dead flowers and the unforgotten tones of long-silent music. Shelley realizes this, though he does attempt an incarnation of the ideal of love in nature in "Prometheus Unbound;" but even that incarnation is too spiritual a form to be apprehended by flesh and blood. It also is but a prototype, a conception, a thing of the imagination. The radiant Asia, far away in an Indian vale, in exile from Prometheus, arouses in us no human or earthly sympathies, but at once appears to mortal eyes to be an immaterial thing; then, finally, at the moment of her transfiguration, she is so completely spiritualized, raised so far above the grossness of earthly substance, that she fills with her own light

The earth and heaven,
And the deep ocean and the sunless caves,
And all that dwells within them.

Spirit voices sing to her a song which translates in human speech her beauty and herself, and which on that account I venture to quote :

Life of life! thy lips enkindle
 With their love the breath between them;
 And thy smiles, before they dwindle,
 Make the cold air fire. Then screen them
 In those looks where whose gazes
 Faints, entangled in their mazes.
 Child of light! thy limbs are burning
 Through the vest which seems to hide them,
 As the radiant lines of morning
 Through the clouds, ere they divide them;
 And this atmosphere divinest
 Shrouds thee wheresoe'er thou shinest.
 Fair are others; none beholds thee—
 But thy voice sounds low and tender,
 Like the fairest, for it folds thee
 From the sight—that liquid splendor—
 And all feel, yet see thee never,
 As I feel now, lost forever!
 Lamp of earth! where'er thou movest,
 Its dim shapes are clad with brightness,
 And the souls of whom thou lovest
 Walk upon the winds with lightness,
 Till they fail, as I am failing,
 Dizzy, lost, yet unbewailing.

With this intense spiritualization of the ideal of love in nature it would seem that common humanity could have no sympathy or intercourse. And yet the Shelleyan conception of a spirit of love in man existing side by side with the spirit of love in nature effects at least a partial communion. The glorifying presence of the latter would fade if it were not mingled with the vivifying power of the former. Evil reigns and good is exiled only as long as the two are parted. Incarnated in Prometheus—"the type of the highest perfection of moral and intellectual nature, impelled by the purest and truest motives to the best and noblest ends"—the spirit of love in man finally weds his transfigured Asia at the hour of Jove's fall. The two touch, mingle, become one, and good reigns all in all. Then dawns the morn of love, when Nature resumes the beauty of her prime, and

Love, from its awful throne of patient power
 In the wise heart, from the last giddy hour

Of dread endurance, from the slippery, steep,
And narrow verge of crag-like agony, springs
And folds over the world its healing wings.

Man remains—

Scepterless, free, uncircumscribed, but man;
Equal, unclassed, tribeless, and nationless,
Exempt from awe, worship, degree—the king
Over himself.

This union of man and nature—symbolized by Shelley in the union of Prometheus and Asia, through whom love in man is wedded to love in nature—and the consequent triumph of good in all things, are ideas which Wordsworth also held and taught, though in an entirely different way. The Grasmere poet, as did Shelley, found in nature a living presence, entering into flower, mountain, and stream and giving each its own beauty and light. But the boyhood that was spent at Cockermouth and Hawkshead was blessed by an even tenor of joy quite different from that unhappy lonesomeness which blasted the childhood at Field Place and Sion House. To Wordsworth nature was a haunting presence that taught “rememberable things;” to Shelley it was a mysterious, tranquilizing influence that brought an ecstasy of pleasure. To that one it was thought that supplied the vital principle to nature; to this one it was love. Wordsworth’s faith, therefore, belongs to the realm of quiet contemplation; Shelley’s, to the realm of pure imagination. That is the first difference between the faiths of the two poets—a difference in kind. A second remains to be noted—that separating the two poets in their relations to humanity. Wordsworth found existing between the soul of things and the mind of man a harmony, whereby Nature could and did communicate with man and conform him to herself until an absolute union grew up between them. Through this love for nature he was brought to a love for the lowly “statesman” of his native hills, and found in man at length

An object of delight,
Of pure imagination, and of love.

Through nature he passed to man. But not so with Shelley. No such growth from one love to the other is traceable. Love in man exists side by side with love in nature, each dependent upon the other, and the two wedded into one finally according

to a preexisting plan. Man as an individual is consequently not of interest to him; only the abstract man—humanity.

And these two differences in faith, particularly the difference between Wordsworth's conception of the essential principle of life in nature and Shelley's, caused a marked difference in the tone and spirit of their poetry. A comparison of two poems, each characteristic of its author, will perhaps best illustrate and reinforce the truth of this statement. "It was on a beautiful summer evening," writes Mary Shelley, "while wandering among the lanes whose myrtle hedges were the bowers of the fireflies, that we heard the caroling of the skylark." While Shelley listened to the strains of the bird soaring aloft in the blue Italian heavens his heart broke out in greeting as to a celestial singer—

Hail to thee, blithe spirit!—
Bird thou never wert—
That from heaven or near it
Pourest thy full heart
In profuse strains of unpremeditated art.

"Better than all measures of delightful sound," the bird's song lifted him out of himself into a spiritual euthanasia that lasted until the song ceased. For the poet found in the bird a creature above the limitations of the human heart, loving, yet never knowing "love's sad satiety"—in every way an image of that ideal for which he strove. Not so does the same skylark move the contemplative Wordsworth; an ethereal minstrel, a pilgrim of the sky, it is yet by no means a spirit, "an unbodied joy whose race is just begun," pouring from aloft upon the earth a flood of spiritual harmony. The ethereal minstrel never drops its earthly body, to Wordsworth's eyes, or loses sight of its little nest sheltered on the brown ground beneath it.

Type of the wise, who soar but never roam;
True to the kindred points of heaven and home,

Wordsworth's skylark never deemed of death "things more true and deep than we mortals dream."

This tendency toward a spiritualization of things material distinguishes Shelley's poetry as a whole from Wordsworth's. Contemplating nature and loving her with a personal love, Wordsworth found in her a living personality whose character, works, and ways he could quietly brood upon. Hence, it was

possible for him to observe minutely her beauties and describe them in his verse. The little celandine, the daffodil, the waterfall, the butterfly, and "the immeasurable height of woods, decaying, never to be decayed"—each was a feature of the great face of nature, each had at times almost an individuality of its own; for it is, I believe, only in its general tendency that his faith may be said to be pantheistic. But it was quite otherwise with Shelley. The great spirit of nature was to him hardly a personality; it was evanescent and fleeting, never defining its whole self in the petals of a flower or shutting itself up as a distinct and independent being in the waters of a lake or the bark of a tree. He saw only her shadow and only evidences of her presence in the whole material world. So there was never possible for him a minute dwelling upon what we may call the homely aspects of mountain and meadow. The evanescent shadow fled rather among the pile on pile of cloud masses far above the earth, or paused amid majestic mountain summits, or dwelt a spirit in the intangible forms of half-forgotten music or of hardly remembered experiences. To the regions of Queen Mab, for example, belong those hills and cities which Julian saw with Maddalo by sunset from the spit of land that breaks the flow of the Adriatic toward Venice. Likewise, the rugged mountains through which Alastor passed and the solitary dell where he died appear in Shelley's verse like the wild and rocky wastes men see in dreams. So, too, the great drama of Prometheus is unfolded to its conclusion on the lofty cliffs of Caucasus, cloud-enveloped and built of clouds, and in the valleys of the sky.

This spiritualization extends to mankind; the people of the poems are less human than spiritual. The lowly dalesmen of the hills, whom Wordsworth loved, were flesh and blood, sturdy and smelling of the soil of earth; the creatures of Shelley's imagination are ethereal forms, about whose garments still clings the fragrance of heavenly fire. The "disembodied soul" of Ianthe reached the hall of spells and saw the passions of men and the wickedness of the world. Thus, as early in his poetic career as the composition of "Queen Mab," we find the poet attempting to spiritualize his subject; and, rude as is the attempt, it foreshadows the sublime idealizations of "Prometheus Unbound" and "The Sensitive Plant." Alastor, Athanase, and Lionel are hardly men, scarcely personalities; they are incarna-

tions of humanity etherealized by the ideal of love which has breathed on them and burned away the grossness of matter. Alastor, though still possessing the limbs and features of a man, is weirdly inhuman and airy :

The mountaineer,
Encountering on some dizzy precipice
That spectral form, deemed that the spirit of wind,
With lightning eyes, and eager breath, and feet
Disturbing not the drifted snow, had paused
In its career.

That shallop on the shore, long abandoned, its sides gaping wide "with many a rift" and its joints swaying "with the undulating tide," was too frail a craft to bear the weight of flesh and blood over the stormy waters of the Chorasmian deep. The immaterial spirit of a man transfigured by the power of love sat at the helm. Lionel, also, faded away, until

The blood in his translucent veins
Beat not like animal life, but love
Seemed now its sullen springs to move,
When life had failed and all its pains.

Finally, in "Prometheus Unbound" the actors are all pure spirit, ethereal and of the heavens, creatures of the soaring imagination. Prometheus, Asia, Earth, Morn, the Echoes, the Hours are airy nothings, without a local habitation, almost without a name.

A further effect was produced upon Shelley's poetry by this ethereal ideal of nature and love, an effect directly traceable to the influence which the ideal exerted upon his life. Wordsworth, quieted into a joyous calm by nature, lived a life of tranquillity and contemplation; there were no strivings and no disappointments—at least, after the despondency of his young manhood was brushed away. His days were "bound each to each by natural piety;" nothing ever disturbed his "cheerful faith" that all things are "full of blessings." It was not so with Shelley, whose entire life was a longing and yearning for his ideal.

He, as I guess,
Had gazed on nature's naked loveliness,
Actæon-like; and now he fled astray
With feeble steps o'er the world's wilderness,
And his own thoughts along that rugged way
Pursued, like raging hounds, their father and their prey.

Consequently, instead of the placidity which marks the flow of Wordsworth's verse, there is present in Shelley's poetry an

alternation of exultation, when the ideal seems attained, and of despondency, when the evanescent form eludes his grasp. If we look beneath the allegory we shall find in Alastor, in Athanase, in Lionel the sad history of Shelley's own strivings after the ideal form of love. He believed it was found in Harriet, and as long as the delusion lasted he was happy in her. During the glad, sweet days in the cottage at Lynmouth he looked forward to a future of ardent love and pure thoughts for her and for himself. But the ideal faded; Harriet, divested of the garment of love which Shelley had thrown about her, appeared a selfish and loveless girl; then succeeds a period of despondency which seeks expression in his verse. A minor chord runs through the shorter poems of the first six months of 1814, when his hearth was cold and solitary. Then Mary, with "her brown eyes bright and clear," wooed him once again to life and hope and gave him strength to write in prophecy "The Revolt of Islam" and the triumphs of the golden city. But when pain of body returned, and his children were taken from him, and even Mary seemed to grow cold, he was plunged again into gloom. So came into being, in 1818, the "Lines Written in the Euganean Hills," when the poet found an island "in the deep, wide sea of misery;" and, at the close of the same year, the "Stanzas Written in Dejection," when without health or hope, beaten and buffeted by the world, he sobbed out—

Yet now despair itself is mild,
Even as the winds and waters are.
I could lie down like a tired child
And weep away the life of care,
Which I have borne and yet must bear—
Till death like sleep might steal on me,
And I might feel in the warm air
My cheek grow cold, and hear the sea
Breathe o'er my dying brain its last monotony.

Finally, in "Epipsychidion," he tells us how he found again a human form of his ideal, to be again disheartened by a shattering of its beauty. Like Athanase and Lionel, Shelley had wedded one who seemed a radiant maiden all instinct with love and life, only in the end to suffer chilling disappointment; and like them, too, he found a heavenly being to kiss his lips and win him back to life. About the unfortunate Harriet and the

beautiful Mary he had in turn twined his affections to discover in one Pandemos and in the other the fair Urania.

It is not strange that we find, in the poetry of one who thus sought and lost and yet was ever seeking the ideal, a deep appreciation of that art which can best reflect a soul-pervading aspiration. Free from all corporeal conditions and limitations, music was specially fitted to express to the poet's mind the spiritual ideal of his heart and to convey to him, not alone the ecstasies of earthly or heavenly love, but as well the elements of pure passion, which is their foundation. Shelley's fondness for music, then, is not strange or surprising. "Music made giddy the dim brain, faint with intoxication of keen joy." He was carried away by Mozart, and drew from Constantia's song and the notes of Jane's guitar a deep satisfaction. The swelling of Miss Clairmont's rich voice produced in him a state of bliss, in which the cope of heaven seemed rent and the soul developed wings with which to follow the sublime career of the soaring song:

A breathless awe, like the swift change,
Unseen, but felt in youthful slumbers,
Wild, sweet, but uncommunicably strange,
Thou breakest now in fast-ascending numbers.
The cope of heaven seems rent and cloven
By the enchantment of thy strain,
And on my shoulders wings are woven,
To follow its sublime career
Beyond the mighty moons that wane
Upon the verge of nature's utmost sphere,
Till the world's shadowy walls are passed and disappear.

Similarly he recognizes in later lyrics, and in short lines in the longer poems, this power of music to carry one above the noises of earth to the serene heights of spiritual intoxication.

Moreover, this ethereal ideal of nature and love which had such a marked effect on Shelley's life, and thus indirectly on his poetry, exerted as strong an influence on his poems directly. It purified them of the fleshly dross and gave them a sublimely spiritual texture. The ideal affected Shelley's verse in much the same way as Alastor's knowledge affected his dreams. "Conversant with speculations of the sublimest and most perfect natures, the vision in which he embodies his imaginations unites all of wonderful or wise or beautiful which the poet, the philosopher, or the lover could depicture." "The Ode to the West

Wind" and "The Sensitive Plant" display this spiritual richness and prove themselves to be the songs of an Ariel, while the elegy on Keats is the threnody of a spirit concerning a spirit. There is nothing mortal or material about Adonais.

He is made one with nature. There is heard
His voice in all her music, from the moan
Of thunder to the song of night's sweet bird,
He is a presence to be felt and known
In darkness and in light—

made spirit by gazing on the form of nature's loveliness. Shelley was enabled to catch, better than any other of our poets, the subtle and fleeting graces that belong to evanescent forms of things, to states of mind and of the imagination. All the visible scenes of nature entered unawares into his heart and became for him ideal rather than real. Similarly he drew most exquisite sensuous pleasure from material things, but a pleasure that is spiritually sensuous:

And from the moss, violets and jonquils peep
And dart their arrowy odor through the brain,
Till you might faint with that delicious pain;

while from the bells of the hyacinth he heard sweet peals

Of music so delicate, soft, and intense,
It was felt like an odor within the sense.

In like manner he pierced behind the veil of mortal limitations and felt the glories of past but not forgotten days, and buoyantly rode upon the waves of purely spiritual emotion. Spiritualized, etherealized by the power of his ideal, he took things of sense—material things—and transmuted them into evanescent and fleeting essences of cloud and air and spirit. Well, indeed, did Trelawny inscribe upon his tomb, beneath Leigh Hunt's "Cor cordium," the Ariel song from "The Tempest"—

Nothing of him that doth fade
But doth suffer a sea change
Into something rich and strange.

William E. Imper.



ART. IV.—THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

Is there a social problem? That is to say, is it worth while to perplex ourselves about methods of effecting a more equitable division of the fruits of human industry? Can it be secured? The question is not a frivolous one, nor does it imply any sarcasm. For, strictly speaking, orthodox political economy teaches us that a social problem relative to distribution is as absurd as a social problem about gravitation. The product of human industry is portioned out to the several groups of producers by natural laws. There is no power in society to change these allotments. Each man gets just what belongs to him; he cannot get either more or less. There may, indeed, be fraud in exchange, and contracts may be violated. But in these cases the problem is one of morals or of legislation to enjoin contracts; but the division of the product of organized or agricultural industries is assigned to the different partners by inexorable laws.

Such is the dogma of economic science. It follows from it that there is no injustice to do away with by reform, no wrongs of labor, no encroachments of capital. The devout soul, recognizing natural laws as the will of a benevolent Creator and accepting this economic dogma, must declare that the actual division of the fruits of industry is equitable and just. In much of the discussion between the economist and the philanthropic reformer the economic dogma is misunderstood or misapplied; and it may, therefore, be worth while, as a step toward more equitable discussion, to answer with some care the question, "Is there a social problem?" This present attempt to make reply will drop out of view the extensive literature of the subject and take up the question, so to say, on its merits. Our brief study may be helped to a clear issue by recalling at once, by the side of the economic dogma, the answer to it made by the philanthropic reformer. He affirms that the so-called laws of nature in economics are not natural, but historical, products. The rent of the landlord, the interest of the capitalist, the profits of the manufacturer, are all growths of human history. Each of them involves abuses impiously consecrated by society. This system of industry, with the wage-earner at the bottom and entitled

to only the part left by his partners, is as monstrous an outrage upon natural law as absolutism in government or human slavery. If the economic dogmatist supports his theory by an appeal to history the reformer replies: "You are right; it has always been so; but so, too, have absolutism and human slavery always existed. That did not deter us from driving absolutism and slavery out of our most highly civilized societies."

Here we may profit by reflecting upon the value of the word "historical" in this discussion. Its meaning suggests to us the development of human institutions under the leadership of human nature. Some things in human life concern variable and mutable elements of humanity. Other things concern invariable and immutable elements. Men do change in their ideas of government, and slavery comes, at length, to shock their sense of equity or to oppose their conceptions of economic efficiency. Now, the economic dogma professes to rest upon an immutable thing in man—his self-interest or his selfishness. The dogmatist does not deny that individuals rise above the level of self-seeking, but he asserts that the mass of mankind live on that level, have always lived there, and probably always will live there. The unselfish will feed the hungry, care for the sick, and clothe the naked by acts of beneficence. But laborer, manufacturer, capitalist, landlord will always work for personal rewards. The great strength of the economic dogma lies in its agreement with the actual, everyday facts of industry. Each man in each group is, as a matter of plain fact, working for his own interest. This is not a final answer, for reasons now to be suggested.

To reach our end as soon as possible we shall assume that interest upon capital is a just and natural thing. It is practically certain that but little capital would exist if savings could not be converted into capital by employing labor at a profit in the nature of interest. With the same brevity we assume President Francis Walker's fourth partner—the master or manager—making his own share, called profits, by his abilities. It is easy to see that ability, by buying the material, economizing labor, and selling the product advantageously, may pay laborer, landlord, and capitalist the same ratio as is paid by inferior ability, and still make a relatively large profit. That each partner seems to get his share through a natural order

of what, in general terms, may be called supply and demand, is admitted on all sides. It may be also conceded that no civilized society like ours can be expected to interrupt this order by violence or revolution. Such changes as may come must be looked for along the lines of least resistance, or, in other terms, along the lines followed by existing habits. Though political economy is called a dismal science and is supposed to be unpopular, yet it remains true that men in general accept the economic dogma, and will resist the attempt to establish communistic socialism in defiance of the dogma. Revolution being out of the question, let us inquire for the lines of least resistance to philanthropic reform. Without the least hesitation we affirm that philanthropy has already set out upon the line of socialistic taxation of land, capitals, and abilities.

The oppressive partner of labor, according to moderate socialism, is the landlord. The economic dogmatist asserts that land rent is a bounty, not a product of labor. "True," replies the reformer; "God made the land and gave it to society, and society has further enriched it." It seems to me that in this famous and noisy controversy each side fails to grasp a fact; one side ignores one fact, and the other another. Land gets all, or nearly all, its value in exchange from personal and social co-operation. In any given lot or acre having an exchange or rent-producing power there is a personal as well as a social product. The succession of owners have done something to enrich the lot or acre, and something has been done by society. This personal contribution is overlooked by one side. The other party to the controversy does not seem to grasp the fact that in highly civilized societies the single-tax system is actually in operation. Municipal government is, in this country, our most complex and advanced type of social order. But no one needs to be told that municipal government draws its revenues from real estate, or that the city lot is taxed all it will bear. If there is any failure anywhere to collect the full annual value of the bounty the failure is temporary or local. The landlord of the future is not likely to get more than a fair return for his capital. And (omitting the dishonesties of municipal service as being no part of the economic problem) this land tax is socially expended for streets, walks, parks, police, hospitals, and

schools. It might be desirable that the national government should be supported by the same tax; but there is no proof that there is enough bounty to pay both national and municipal bills. It is pretty certain that the city fathers of the future may be trusted to collect and use all the bounty there is in sight. The tax on personal property could be dropped without serious loss. If here or there one may find some startling proof that the landlord is a burden upon society, especially upon the poor, he has only to turn to Chicago, New York, or Philadelphia taxation for proof that these highly organized human societies have found effective means of realizing Mr. George's ideal state, and that the governments of these cities are fastening their grasp firmly upon the bounty in city lots.

If, therefore, landlordism is an abuse in society—and no doubt it has been an abuse, and to some extent still is, in Europe and in some sections of our own country—yet all the indications point to effective reform of the abuse. The landlord of the future will be fortunate if he is able to keep intact the capital he and his predecessors have invested in land. But this statement of the case contains an implication that there is, or at least *was*, a social problem regarding land, and that it is undergoing a socialistic solution of a very radical character. City government collects the natural and social bounty and expends it for the whole community. The beauty of it is that this same immutable human nature has almost instinctively remedied the evil, and that no one needs to help nature to her end. City government works as automatically, under universal suffrage, as landlordism ever did. We have only to extend the civilization of our great American cities—only to “let it alone”—to make it practically certain that no man gets from ground rent what does not belong to him as a fruit of his capital.

The same state of things may be found in the more common methods of taxing agricultural land; and possibly the agricultural distress much complained of may be partly due to the severe application of the principles of Mr. George. Much more than natural or bounty rent may have been exacted of the farmer. Turning again to the city method of taxation, it may be useful to remember that city authorities are too practical to tax vacant lots as much as improved lots. The city fathers want money, and do not risk profitless confiscation.

We repeat, then, that the bounty rent of land is, in our judgment, already secured to society through existing methods of taxation. The result has not been to equalize the rewards of the different groups of producers in any such way as has been expected. It will probably reward our pains to examine a little the very different fate of other natural bounties. The rich sources of modern wealth are found, not in land, but in other natural wealth discovered in this century. Invention has laid the foundations of most of our great fortunes. Rock oil, telephones, telegraphs, new methods of making steel, and a thousand other inventions are the sources of a very large part of the massed wealth of the United States. And yet we hear hardly a whisper against the most real and the largest class of monopolies. A patent creates the only real monopoly known under our system. The philanthropic reformer will do well to fix his attention upon the patent laws and the wealth diverted by them from the people, not to inventors, but to a small number of enterprising persons. It is an amazing thing that the people are so patient under these monopolistic laws, which are not of nature but of the nation.

It is evident that the democratic instinct has found in taxation a practically effective means of rectifying distribution, so far as rectification is possible. No possible method will avail to alter the proportions of product going to labor, capital, and management. The dogmatic economist is here on solid ground. The laws of supply and demand will go on dividing the product in spite of any possible reforms. But taxation may recoup profits and interest and expend them for the general good. That this line of advance is beginning to attract attention, and that it will be marched over in the next century, no one seriously doubts. The doubtful questions are those of method and of opportunity. Licenses to manufacture, graduated income taxes, governmental management of industries, and other methods are in the field of discussion. Ownership by government of railways and telegraphs is neither a new thing nor a very enticing scheme. Heavy taxation of the companies is a more consistent scheme, and American instinct has gradually approached this solution. The taxes paid by railway companies are increased year by year. The State of Pennsylvania annually levies millions from corporations and expends the bulk

of this vast sum upon public education. Socialistic taxation of interest and profits may or may not meet the demands of the less fortunate classes. Probably it will not. For it will not increase wages and may possibly narrow the field of employment and thus really reduce wages. Socialistic taxation of capital needs to be administered with the same caution used by city government in taxing lands. One must not kill the goose if he would gather the golden eggs. Public ownership of railways has proved burdensome in France and Italy, and in this country even confiscation might result in a loss. A democratic government can trust itself to collect a tax, but it could hardly trust itself to collect just fares and freights from distant voters whose influence might decide a presidential election. The unequal equality of the post office department—charging the same price for carrying a letter across a block or across the continent—is a kind of equality much sought after in transportation. Taxation is far safer.

What can be accomplished by socialistic taxation? What benefits will come from it to the working classes? In other words, what can be done with the new millions gained by taxing profits and capital as much as they will bear? The question is comparatively new, although Rome long ago answered it by giving its plebs "bread and games." What we have for a century contended over is probably impossible—to rearrange the natural division of the product of industry. There is, indeed, a hopeful view. Mr. Carey held that the natural law of the case tends to a steady though slow relative increase of wages. But this is too slow to keep pace with our desires for human amelioration. Admitting that wages must increase relatively, the average wage-earner will remain relatively poor; and this relative poverty is the very gravamen of the charge against the existing social system. No one expects wages to gain upon the other shares of product to such an extent that a few years of labor will make a man a millionaire. If we can and do assist this natural gain by socialistic taxation there will still be no millions for the wage-earner, while capital and managerial ability may go on amassing millions, more slowly, perhaps, but still surely. Supposing, however, that the State should treble its present income by taxing capital and abilities, what service could be rendered by use of it to these people? Circus tickets


and free loaves are not to be considered. Schools, parks, streets, water, asylums, and hospitals are already provided at public expense. Could the State establish a system of free homes, with heat and light free also? And would this please the self-respecting wage-earner? The suggestion is nearly as absurd as the free circus tickets. It would be possible to provide more hospitals and much more room in poorhouses. But reforming philanthropy will not entertain the suggestion.

There is one open road along which public distribution might travel with dignity. The State might provide a pension for every invalid, every poor widow, every orphan child, every one bearing the infirmities of age. We are learning in our system of war pensions how to conduct such a distribution on a large scale. In short, it is possible for a State, by socialistic taxation, to render real poverty of the suffering sort absolutely impossible. For that part of the body of reformers concerning itself with actual primary wants the solution suggested would be entirely satisfactory. This would not settle the so-called social question. The inequality of the distribution effected under the existing system of competitive industry would remain untouched. The State would merely take away from capital and ability a part of their shares and disburse it among the needy sons of poverty. Nor would the moralist be quite contented with a system of distribution by act of Congress and of the pension agent. And, absolute poverty having become impossible and the saloon remaining open, would not the poor multiply more rapidly?

Doubts and fears have seemed to melt away while we were taking some of the first steps in this reform by redistribution. The public schools met a vigorous opposition when they cost less than half as much as they now cost. The opposition has ceased, and every town of five thousand people will soon have a college maintained at public expense. There is no open hostility to taxing corporations severely. The rich man's death is more and more looked to as a means of redistributing a part of his estate by a succession tax. A very large increase of this tax will meet no obstacle in public opinion whenever the State has found a good use for the money of the dead. Trust estates, such as those of the Vanderbilts and Gould, would be remorselessly seized by the public—pensions being paid to the heirs—if the public had a use for them. The real difficulty is not any

obstacle to socialistic taxation, but the lack of socialistic uses of taxation. Make any such use as popular as the public schools are, and the money will be freely taken by some device of taxation. The delay in devising methods of using the rich man's money for the poor man's good is largely due to the ill-advised efforts of many reformers to distribute more equitably in the very original processes of production and exchange. The delay is further helped by ill-advised clamors for a cheap money or other attacks on confidence and credit. But as soon as reformers learn that they cannot seriously alter the original distribution they may be expected to take up the question of redistribution; and taxation affords them the prospect of unlimited supplies for philanthropic enterprises.

The foregoing suggestions are an attempt to outline in few words the situation and its outlooks. With whatever results, we are likely to attempt to abolish poverty by the method here indicated. There must be some unsatisfactory results. The socialistic State needs a better civil service system than it is in the way of getting. Robbery in the form of taxation for the benefit of spoilsmen threatens every step of our progress with disaster. God's poor and man's poor can be relieved by the system suggested; but the multiplication of the devil's poor under the system may be reasonably feared. As all sturdiness went out of the Roman plebs when fed from public granaries, we may dread a like loss of force in laborers relieved from all danger of severe privation; and all the difficulties of the present situation may be increased by diminishing the dangers of idleness and inefficiency. But the American democracy is capable of running great risks for the sake of promoting the general welfare—that is to say, individual welfare—and may be capable of triumphing over all the dangers of socialistic redistribution by means of universal suffrage.



ART. V.—THE CALL AND ORDINATION OF BARNABAS AND SAUL TO MISSIONARY WORK.

IN religion, as in all else, there is a tendency on the part of the human mind to get away from first principles, in the sense of seeking new foundations or new motives to action. There comes a time when the original impulse seems to have spent its force; when foundation truths disappear or are held in more main; and when, somehow, the notion finds entrance that the old truth, perhaps because it is old, should be abandoned for something newer if not better. And thus it has come to pass that men have substituted maxims of worldly wisdom for the plain precepts of the Master; and, for apostolic practice and precedent, methods which they judge to be more in keeping with changed times and advanced thought. This tendency has left its impress quite as much upon the spiritual life of the Church as upon its prudential regulations. Under its influence the simplicity of primitive Christian worship was replaced by an elaborate ritual. That agony of soul which made holy men of old loathe their daily food while they waited upon God in ceaseless prayer was supplanted by perfunctory fast days, which in turn have been abandoned by many as unprofitable and vain. The sacraments, designed as means of edification and spiritual growth, became "mysteries," exciting awe and ultimately, regarding one of them, claiming adoration; while a distinction of gifts in the Church, pointing to a distinction of office and work, became a distinction of orders, by which a ministry chosen of God was changed into a priesthood ordained of men. The same tendency is in operation to-day, and the clear guidance of the Spirit of God is in danger of being ignored in an unwisdom attempt to harmonize old methods with "the spirit of the age." If these things were only passing symptoms of a critical and skeptical disposition in the world we might hold our peace, or at best say, "The Lord rebuke thee;" but they are more than that—they are symptoms of a canker that is eating into the heart of the Church. The mischief is a serious one, and calls for a remedy. That remedy is a return to first principles—a constant comparison of our teachings and methods with the spirit and practice of primitive Christianity.

The most important and weighty official act which Christ authorized his Church to perform is the setting apart, by solemn ordination, of men who believe that they are moved by the Holy Ghost to the office and work of ministers in the Church of God. In constituting the ministry of the Church, whether evangelists, pastors, or teachers, we should keep very close to New Testament teaching and precedent, and at every step listen reverently to the voice which speaks to us as once it spoke to Moses, saying, "Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount."

Turn we, then, to the record (Acts xiii, 2, 3) of the earliest occasion on which the solemn function of setting apart God's chosen messengers was exercised by the primitive Church. In the divine drama of the kingdom of God there is here a shifting of the scenes. Antioch, in Syria, appears in place of Jerusalem, and instead of the apostles we have the prophets and teachers of that congregation where the disciples were first called Christians. And with this shifting of scenes and change of actors we have an entirely new departure along evangelistic lines. Hitherto the thought of a world-wide evangelization had been imperfectly apprehended, for, with the exception of Peter's visit to the house of Cornelius and the brief sojourn of Philip at Samaria, followed by a visit from Peter and John, no direct effort seems to have been made to carry out the Saviour's command to disciple all nations. It is true that some of those who were scattered abroad by the persecution traveled as far as Phœnicia and Cyprus; and Barnabas, who himself belonged to Cyprus, may have been a fruit of that very mission. But these scattered disciples preached the Gospel to Jews alone, and it was only at Antioch that some spake to the Greeks also. No sustained effort had been made to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. But all this was now to be changed. Barnabas and Saul had been laboring together at Antioch for a year, teaching much people and confirming the faith of the saints, when there came to the "prophets and teachers" in that city a call from the Holy Ghost; for, "as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Whereupon they were not disobedient to the heavenly vision, but proceeded at once to ordain

and send forth the first two foreign missionaries of the Christian Church.

- The Christian ministry, as the New Testament presents it, is not a profession, but a divine vocation; and if so, there must be some method by which that divine call can be given and understood. In considering this question we are not invading a realm of dreams. If what we designate a divine call is a mere superstitious fancy the Christian ministry and all that pertains to it is the veriest imposture that was ever devised to lead men astray. But those who can believe this are bound to account for the wonderful effects of so strange a delusion; for, whether it be a reality or not, one thing is certain—belief in a divine call has produced such examples of lofty devotion to duty, of disinterested effort for the weal of others, of heroic courage in the face of appalling dangers, of sacrifice and suffering cheerfully borne for conscience' sake, as history attributes to no other impulse. The fact, with all that it involves, is important enough to justify patient investigation, step by step.

The Person who gives the call is said to be the Holy Ghost—a term in very common use, but the meaning of which is vaguely apprehended. Men affirm, for example, and they do so on scriptural authority, that God is a Spirit; but when they speak of the Spirit of God—in other words, the Spirit of a Spirit—there is a degree of mental confusion from which they seek to escape by declaring that this great truth is a mystery which they cannot explain. If they mean by this that the finite mind cannot comprehend the Infinite One we have no disposition to dispute the statement; but if they mean that Christian faith in so important a matter has no better basis than vague mysteries that admit of no explanation we are constrained to demur. The whole question ultimately turns on the reality of an invisible spiritual realm. Altogether apart from religion men do admit the fact of an invisible world, that is, a world of thought and feeling as distinguished from a world of fact and activity, a realm as truly unseen as that which we call spiritual. Again, it is universally admitted that forces which are invisible—thought, hope, faith, ambition—are by far the most potent in shaping human actions, and that they act and react from man to man. Now, from this conception of an invisible spiritual realm and invisible forces, influencing human conduct and

becoming a part of human consciousness, there is a natural and easy (we had almost said necessary) transition to the conception, as taught in the Scriptures, of a spiritual Intelligence—a Person—who is the infallible Teacher of infallible truth and the supreme authority in Christ's invisible kingdom. But, having made the transition, we begin to perceive that "Person" is a term which suggests limitations that cannot be consistently affirmed of an infinite and infallible Being. Some new term must be found, or the old term enlarged to the measure of that larger thought. Such a term the Scriptures supply, for "Holy Ghost" is but the complete development of the idea of a personality that is not limited, and is the only term which adequately expresses the concept of an infinite Intelligence.

Now, in the Scriptures, preeminently in the New Testament, the Holy Spirit is represented as holding peculiar relations to individual Christians and to the Church as a whole. But these relations or offices are not in all respects the same. Speaking in a broad, general sense, the Holy Spirit may be said to have taken up the work of human salvation at the point where Christ laid it down; and everything involved in Christ's actual living presence, and more, is secured by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. In place of the visible Leader, the man Christ Jesus, the Church has now the Holy Ghost, the invisible spiritual guide. As of old, he works in human hearts, reproving, convincing of sin, regenerating, and bearing witness to the fact of men's adoption into the family of God; while in the Church, if it be a true Church of God, he dwells to govern, to direct, to show what is the mind of God; and through men like these prophets and teachers at Antioch, chosen and qualified by himself, he directs the Church in her providential mission.

But how is the call to the ministry given? This is a question of no small importance, and answers to it may traverse the whole ground between a chilling rationalism on the one hand and a misleading enthusiasm on the other. So far as the passage under consideration can guide us, the call is twofold:

1. That to the individual chosen. This is not God's universal call to men to repent and believe the Gospel, nor is it that general call to Christian service which authorizes him that heareth to say, "Come;" but it is a special call to converted men whom God hath chosen that they may be separated from

all other employments and given wholly to the ministry of the word. So far as this call is a purpose in the mind of God it may long precede the conversion, or even the birth, of the person chosen. Thus, John the Baptist was designated as our Lord's forerunner, and Saul himself was a "chosen vessel" for a special work long before it was known to himself or to the Church. But so far as it constitutes a summons to the person chosen it is the voice of the Spirit in the heart, producing a deep and abiding conviction of duty as to the ministry of the word. Without it neither pope nor bishop, church nor council, can give the necessary authority; and with it no other authority is needed. The duty or prerogative of the Church, either collectively or through chosen representatives, is not to confer authority, but to recognize and give effect to a divine call, an authority already conferred. But for the satisfaction of the Church, as well as the quiet of the individual conscience, it is most needful that the reality of this inward call be attested by concurrent evidence. Saul's inward call was attested in many ways; but so far as we can learn neither he nor Barnabas pressed their convictions upon the notice of the Church, or tried to forestall the Holy Spirit in making known to others what he had already made known to them. Neither did they attempt to force themselves into the work to which they had been divinely called. Beyond the faithful use of their gifts in edifying the Church they let the matter rest, patiently awaiting the Lord's time. The period of waiting was not lost time. They were undergoing the best possible preparation for their work, and were proving their possession of those very qualities and endowments which made the message of the Holy Ghost to the Church, when it came, an intelligible thing.

We have said that answers to the question how the Holy Spirit calls men may traverse the whole interval between a destructive rationalism on the one hand and a misleading enthusiasm on the other. Much is said in these days about the mischievous extreme into which sundry persons have fallen in regard to the inspiration or leading of the Holy Spirit, some having gone so far as to affirm that, having his guidance, they need no other aid and can dispense alike with prayer and written word. Such enthusiasm is to be deplored, and we have nothing to say in its defense. That mischief has

resulted from a crude and unscriptural interpretation of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's guidance may be quite true, and it is the duty of every minister to guard the flock of Christ against all such delusions; but, while deprecating the effect of unregulated enthusiasm in spiritual things, we should dread far more the influence of that latent skepticism which, in its anxiety to avoid whatever savors of fanaticism, practically ignores the great truth of the Holy Spirit's presence and guidance in the Church of God. When, under the plea of guarding against fanaticism, the glorious doctrine of the divine leading is obscured or is allowed to lie dormant, a chill like the breath of an Arctic winter falls upon the Church and every bud of promise droops and dies. Such a tendency, beginning in prudencé, will quickly degenerate into the rationalism which reduces the Holy Spirit's guidance to a purely human interpretation of the written records, and will at last sink into the gross Sadduceeism which avows disbelief in either angel or spirit.

But back of all this lies another question. If, as a matter of fact, men are led astray by their own fancy, believing it to be the voice of the Holy Spirit, how are they, in regard to the work of the ministry or to divine leading in general, to discriminate between a genuine and an imaginary call? By various signs, as when the supposed leading is in manifest harmony with scriptural teaching, is in the line with significant providences, or is attested by a concurrent call to the Church. But there is another sign which is preliminary to all these and essential to them, namely, a sound and unmistakable conversion to God. Conversion, it is true, does not necessarily involve a call to the ministry; but it is indispensable to the Spirit's call and guidance, because "the natural man"—the man who is not born of God—"receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." But he that is born of God knows the things of God and is quick to hear his voice. Neither is such a one in danger of being misled. The Holy Spirit is not the author of confusion; he leads not in the direction of pride or self-sufficiency or fanaticism; and if one claiming to have the Spirit's guidance falls into these errors or delusions he only gives painful evidence that he has not the Spirit of Christ, because he knows not the Shepherd's

voice. At the very foundation, therefore, of all questions concerning divine leading or a call to the ministry we place a true scriptural conversion, proved by its fruits—the one indispensable condition without which all claims to superior spiritual illumination or a divine call are but a delusion and a dream.

2. But associated with this inward call of the Holy Spirit there is a call to the Church which is equally distinct and clear. "As they"—the prophets and teachers—"ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Observe, he did not say to Barnabas and Saul, "Separate yourselves." There is no encouragement here to set at defiance all authority and church order on the plea that men are following the leading of the Holy Spirit. While the call of the Spirit is distinct and clear to the messenger, it is none the less so to the Church, whose duty it is to set the messengers apart and ordain them to their work. The Holy Spirit not only called these men, but designated the service they were to perform. "I have called," said the Spirit; "it is yours to set apart, by solemn ordination, the chosen messengers." It is only thus that the Holy Spirit and the Church can cooperate in this all-important matter.

There are several things about this call to the Church which deserve special notice. In the first place, it was not addressed to the Church as a whole, but to chosen men, the prophets and teachers at Antioch. This does not imply that the membership of the Church had been ignored, but simply that their part was already done. Long before this time the Church, in its collective capacity, had recognized in Barnabas and Saul the evidences of converting grace and the possession of gifts and qualities which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, made them efficient ministers of the word in building up and edifying the Church; and as a result of this recognition they, with certain others, were accepted as prophets and teachers among the people. What more natural, therefore, than that these prophets and teachers, whom God had chosen and qualified and whose gifts the Church had recognized, should be the media of communication when the Holy Ghost would make known his will as to those he had called to a special work? If the doctrine respecting the Spirit's authority and guidance be not a delusion there must be some method by which his provi-

dential will is indicated; and if the experience of the primitive Church counts for anything that will is not indicated by a simultaneous illumination of the entire Church, or much less left to the uncertain decision of a majority vote, but is made known to the constituted prophets and teachers in the Church upon whom rests the weight of responsibility in these matters. The illumination which these men received, therefore, was not merely that which belongs to all Christians in varying degrees; neither was it the aggregate of that illumination in the Church at large; it was a special illumination vouchsafed for special purposes, and its genuineness was attested by the fact that it was concurrent with the call which had been previously addressed to Barnabas and Saul. Let not the reader be alarmed at this, nor be in haste to resent it as an invasion of the common rights of Christians. Especially let him not avow skepticism in regard to any such illumination being vouchsafed to the prophets and teachers of the Church to-day, lest in doing so he denies one of the distinctive marks of a true Church of Jesus Christ. For if the Holy Spirit be not with the Church to guide in these all-important matters, wherein is the Church better than a secular society, organized for purely secular purposes?

At the same time it will be readily perceived that the reality and value of the Holy Spirit's leading in the Church, in the sense above indicated, depends upon the spirituality and unselfish devotion of those who are recognized as prophets and teachers, and to whom is committed, in a secondary sense, the direction of Church affairs. The call of the Spirit is not a mere official or perfunctory utterance. It is a message fraught with momentous consequences, and is addressed to those who should be keenly alert to the faintest whisper of his voice and sensitively responsive to his gentlest influence. For should it ever come to pass that the prophets and teachers of the Church become selfish and unspiritual the call of the Spirit will be unheard or disobeyed. Once and again this very thing has occurred. When the voice of God was heard from heaven saying, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him," an unspiritual Church angrily retorted, "Not this man, but Barabbas." In the sixteenth century the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Martin Luther for the work whereto I have called him;" and had the prophets and teachers listened, the result might have

been a regenerated Christendom. But they knew not the day of their gracious visitation. They "separated" the messenger whom God had summoned, indeed, not with fasting and prayer, as did the Church at Antioch, but with excommunication and anathema, thus affording unanswerable proof to all the ages that the Church of Rome, as such, is not a true Church of Christ. Again, in the eighteenth century, the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me John Wesley for the work whereunto I have called him;" and had the prophets and teachers of that period listened and obeyed, Methodism, as a distinct organization, might have been entirely unnecessary, while the Church of England, leavened from center to circumference with spiritual life, would have become the great evangelizing force of the after ages. But instead of recognizing the voice of the Holy Spirit she denounced it as the voice of the tempter. She moved her bishops to prohibit Wesley from preaching in her pulpits, and sent mobs to assail him when he preached by the wayside or in the fields. She forbade him to "preach in the prisons, lest he should make men wicked, and in bedlam, lest he should make them mad." And to-day, although she garnishes the tomb of the prophet whom her fathers sought to slay, she gives but cold entertainment to the great principles for which Wesley contended, and ranks the millions of his spiritual children only as heretics or schismatics. But let us beware lest at any time we fall into the same condemnation, either by sending forth any whom the Holy Spirit hath not chosen, or by failing to send those to whom an undoubted summons has come.

Furthermore, the call came to a Church that was spiritually prepared. "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul." The word translated "ministered" indicates that the Church, or at all events the prophets and teachers, were engaged in acts of worship; and as the worship was associated with fasting we may safely conclude that some question of very grave moment was occupying their thoughts, for fasting with these primitive Christians was by no means a perfunctory observance. When they fasted it was because their deep sense of humiliation, their profound consciousness of need, their longing for some spiritual gift, was so strong and overmastering that it took away all desire for customary indulgences. It is by no means improbable that the

minds of these prophets and teachers were deeply exercised with thoughts of the great commission and the means whereby it could be carried into effect; and, looking for specific heavenly guidance, "they ministered to the Lord and fasted."

Let us direct attention to one other point in connection with this call to the Church. It was a choice of two men whose gifts had already been tried and proved in Christian service. And this proving of the gifts is far more important than the quality of the gifts themselves. If it please God to call men having large gifts, the Church should thankfully accept the boon; but as matter of fact he calls, far more frequently, men of common gifts. The treasure of the Gospel is put into "earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God." In Paul himself we have a conspicuous example. His letters, it is true, are weighty, but his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible. And if one casts his eye over the Church to-day he will find that in all that pertains to the true work of God, the conversion of men and their upbuilding in holiness, the largest harvests have been gathered by men of ordinary gifts who have learned the lesson that "five barley cakes and two small fishes," with Christ's consecrating blessing upon them, will feed a great multitude, when the richest and most abundant viands, without that blessing, will utterly fail.

The call of Barnabas and Saul having been to some extent treated in the preceding pages, it will be less necessary to enlarge upon the circumstances of their ordination; but a brief review of the situation will help to a clear idea of what that ordination involved. These two men were already recognized as prophets and teachers in the Church at Antioch. To this ministry they had been called by the Holy Ghost; and other appointment had they none, so far as we can learn, beyond the recognition by the Church of their gifts and usefulness and the reality of their divine call. One thing seems clear—none of the apostles were directly concerned in the matter. It is true that Barnabas had been sent by the Church at Jerusalem to visit the Church at Antioch, and the apostles may have been concerned in that; but so far as the record shows none of them had ever visited Antioch in the exercise of their apostolic office, nor was any commission, mandate, or other authority sent by them, that we know of, for the setting apart of either Barnabas or Saul as

an evangelist to the Gentiles. But was not Saul himself an apostle? and was not he concerned in the matter? Truly he was called to be the apostle of the Gentiles, but not until after he was set apart as a missionary to the heathen did he exercise the authority of an apostle; nor had his apostleship been recognized in the churches, either by the other apostles or by the congregations of Christians generally. But some one may say, "From what we know of apostolic teaching and practice may we not assume that Saul had been formally authorized by the other apostles to ordain elders or presbyters in the Church of God?" We unhesitatingly answer that in matters of historic fact, especially as connected with the constitution of the Church of Christ and the authority of its ministers, we may "assume" nothing; nor may we infer anything beyond what the record clearly justifies. The early corruption of Christian faith and the prevalence of unscriptural dogma and practice arose from unwarrantable assumptions that were not matters of revelation or of divine command. If anyone can speak with authority in regard to this matter surely it is Paul himself; and he goes out of his way to affirm that neither his gospel, his authority, nor his apostleship were received from man, but by revelation from Jesus Christ. If confirmation of this view is needed the first two chapters of Paul's letter to the Galatians affirm that his call to preach among the Gentiles did not follow from conference with flesh and blood.

The manner of the setting apart of Barnabas and Saul deserves at least a passing notice. "They," that is, the prophets and teachers, "fasted and prayed, and laid their hands upon them and sent them away." Nothing could be more simple or more significant. The fasting which accompanied their previous waiting upon God was continued, showing how deeply important was the act they were performing and how intense was their desire for the Holy Spirit's guidance and blessing. They also prayed; and the subject-matter of their prayers may be readily inferred. Then they laid their hands on them and sent them away, even as the Holy Ghost had commanded.

But it may be said that all this was not an ordination to the ministry in the sense in which we understand the term, nor even in the sense in which it was understood in apostolic times—it was only the setting apart to a special work of two men who

were already ministers of the word, and who perhaps were ordained to that office before. To which it may be answered, "What is ordination to-day but the setting apart to a special work of men whose gifts and graces as ministers of the word have already been proved in service and recognized by the Church? Or what is ordination in any case or for any purpose but a similar setting apart—an appointment to a work or an induction to an office?" And these two questions suggest another, namely, "Should any man be set apart, at the call of the Holy Ghost, to any office or work in the Church of God by anything less impressive than fasting and prayer and the imposition of hands?" Surely, the act of separation should be invested with all possible solemnity, from which we should not be deterred by fears of ministerial autocracy. There is reason to fear that, in our anxiety to keep as far away as possible from hierarchical assumptions, we may model the Church after the fashion of a political democracy rather than according to the pattern shown us in the mount; and that, in avoiding the Scylla of official prerogative and ministerial inequality, we may rush into a Charybdean whirlpool of confusion, where intrigue shall take the place of prayer and fasting, and the gravest concerns of the Church of God shall be decided by votes rather than by the voice of the Holy Ghost.

Concerning the laying on of hands a word may be said. This symbolical act has come down from very ancient times. Under the Old Testament dispensation it was employed in connection with some of the Jewish sacrifices, as when the priests laid their hands upon the head of the animal designed for a burnt offering or upon the head of the scapegoat that was to be sent into the wilderness. In these cases it was symbolical of the transfer of guilt or its penalty from the transgressor to the victim. In the consecration of the Levites the people put their hands upon them, which act symbolized the setting apart of a whole tribe to the service of the tabernacle; while in other cases it symbolized the transfer of authority, as when Moses was commanded to lay his hands on Joshua and to put his honor upon him in the presence of the congregation. In New Testament times the same act reappears, with increased impressiveness and significance. In the course of the Master's ministry we hear of it in connection with the healing of

the sick, as when the ruler said, "My little daughter lieth at the point of death : I pray thee, come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed." And among the "signs" which Jesus declared should follow them that believe is this: "They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Among the apostles the act was associated with the bestowment of the Holy Ghost. When Paul found certain disciples of John the Baptist at Ephesus he baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when he laid his hands on them the Holy Ghost came upon them. When Peter and John visited the infant church at Samaria "they prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost;" and the record adds, "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." But it must not be supposed that God is limited to this one channel of communication, for in the house of Cornelius, while Peter was yet preaching, the Holy Ghost, without imposition of hands, fell on all them that heard the word. It is worthy of note, also, that while the power of working miracles was not confined to the apostles—for great signs followed the preaching of Philip the deacon in Samaria—we have no account that the Holy Ghost was ever given in connection with the laying on of hands, save when that act was performed by the apostles themselves; and it appears to have been only on rare occasions that they exercised the prerogative.

In the ordination of men to work or office in the Church the imposition of hands seems to have been universal; and, in some cases, perhaps in many, when performed by the apostles, it was concurrent with the bestowment of special gifts of the Holy Ghost. Thus Paul, in his first letter to Timothy, exhorts him, saying, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery;" while in the second epistle, referring to the same circumstance, he says, "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." What this particular gift was we are not informed, but it was foretold by prophecy, was bestowed at the time of the imposition of hands, and was a gift that needed to be stirred up if its usefulness was to continue. It is also to be noted that the other presbyters were usually associated with Paul in the laying on of hands; while at Antioch, when Barnabas and

Saul were sent forth, the act was performed by the prophets and teachers alone, and in it none of the apostles had any share. Neither does it appear that any particular gift was bestowed on this occasion, the men being already fully qualified by gifts and grace for the work they had to do. From all this we gather that, while the laying on of hands was an appropriate and expressive symbol in connection with ordination to a particular work, there was no supernatural virtue in the act itself; and, although it pleased God in some instances to bestow a special gift upon one who was being set apart, it had no necessary connection with the act of ordination, but might be regarded as God's attesting witness that the apostles were acting under divine inspiration in all they did or taught.

But when the apostles had all passed away, what then? Who are their successors? Read carefully the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles which they wrote, scan the history of the Church in the post-apostolic and following ages, and there can be but one answer. The apostles left no successors, either as regards the office itself or the particular gifts and powers that pertain to it. They were chosen witnesses of what Jesus did and taught. Especially were they witnesses to the great fact of his resurrection; and the supernatural powers bestowed upon them were necessary to attest the truth of what they taught and to vindicate their authority as infallible teachers in the Church of God. As witnesses, in the sense indicated, they could have no successors, and in other respects no successors were required. The apostolic office and mission were alike temporary, as were some of those special gifts vouchsafed to believers in those primitive times. "Whether there be prophecies," said Paul himself, "they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease." These will no longer be required; but the evangelist, the teacher, the pastor, yea, the prophet in the wider sense, if you will, and all that belongs to his office, will be needed and will be continued until the Gospel has been preached to all nations, and "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ."

A. Sutherland

ART. VI.—DIVERSITY OF LANGUAGE AND NATIONAL
UNITY.

THERE are those who consider language the strongest of all the various ties that bind a people into a body politic, and its influence for national unity the most efficient; and who, for this reason, would restrict a nation to a single form of speech and would have all dialects and discordant linguistic elements crowded out and replaced by the national idiom, or their influence at least contracted and neutralized by other forces, thinking that by this means the integrity of the nation will be best secured.

The fallacy of this reasoning is clearly illustrated in the history of Europe. Do all the people in Europe speaking the same language belong to the same political organization? And do the inhabitants of any one country, as a rule, use but one form of speech? During how many centuries have not the Germans been politically divided into an infinity of kingdoms, principalities, and independent States, in spite of their common official language! Of late we have heard much about a united Germany. But are all those speaking the German tongue now gathered under one scepter? What about the millions of Germans in Austria, Switzerland, Russia, Belgium, Holland, and the several smaller principalities? Even the speech of any one German State is not absolutely homogeneous. The official, the literary, language differs in every instance from the language of the common people as spoken in their homes. Millions of the subjects of the King of Prussia use a language in their daily intercourse which is as different from that used in the legislative assemblies as the Scottish of the Lowlands is from the English of Macaulay. What a variety of dialects and accent does the traveler encounter in going from the Baltic to the Alps!

France is another illustration. For centuries France has imposed its speech on the educated of all Europe. French was and still is the language of diplomacy, and is spoken by the higher classes everywhere. But France has not been able to impose it upon its own subjects as the uniform medium of daily intercourse. In the south, where formerly the Provençal

flourished, the population speak dialects and *patois* more or less intelligible to the inhabitants of the north. In the western part an entire province still speaks the Breton, a language belonging to the Celtic stock and having about as much similarity to French as the latter has to German. In Savoy and several other departments in the southeast, Italian dialects still prevail. Yet the government does not try to crush out these discordant forms of speech nor fear its safety may be endangered because of their existence. We do not hear that the Breton and the Provençal are not loyal citizens, or are less proud of their nationality than the native of Champagne or Touraine. When Alsace and Lorraine were provinces of France, German was spoken in the eastern part, yet the majority of the inhabitants of these provinces were French in sentiment, in spite of their German affinities and language. This was, of course, generally denied by German writers, but they are not to be considered reliable authorities in the case.

In Switzerland as many as four different languages are spoken, yet this diversity of speech is not considered a barrier to national unity. The Swiss is a patriot, whether he be of Germanic or Romanic descent; whether he live on the shores of the beautiful Lemman, or among the lakes across whose crystal waters the arm of Tell once guided his boat; whether he have made his home in the sunny vales of Ticino, or among the snowclad mountain crags of hyperborean Grisons. England does not fear political disruption because Wales and the Scottish Highlands speak Celtic, nor is patriotism on the increase in Ireland now that English has crowded the old Erse to the wall. The political animosity of Erin is not caused by dissimilarity of language, nor will it be cured by homogeneity of speech. Did the American colonies hesitate to declare their independence and to sever the ties that bound them to the mother country because the same language was spoken by the parent and the offspring? In Canada the process of national unification has been but partial; but this is not so much due to the fact that two languages are spoken by the inhabitants as to the difference in their religious code. Were the French Canadians Protestants there would be more prospect for their assimilation; the difference in culture and progress between the two principal sections of the country would not continue

long. There are very few civilized States that present to us the spectacle of absolute homogeneity in language. Even in so small a political organization as Belgium there are three distinct races—the Walloons, who are partly of Celtic extraction; the Flemings, who are of Germanic origin; and the French. In consequence three languages are spoken by the people.

Religion is a much more potent factor in the preservation of national unity than language. This is clearly illustrated in the political history of Europe. It was not diversity of language which caused those terrible civil wars that at various times devastated entire countries, but religious animosity. History teaches that of all the various ties that bind a people into a body politic language is one of the weakest. The great Roman empire, during its most flourishing period, was composed of a congeries of peoples and races of different origins and speaking diverse languages. The same was true of the great Persian empire. And the decline of these and other States was not due to a loose organization, the result of the heterogeneous elements composing the body politic, but to other causes, which had very little or nothing to do with language. To show, on the other hand, that similarity of race and language will not necessarily hold a nation together, I need only to point to Spain. There was a time when it was said that the sun continually shone on some part of the Spanish possessions. And yet Spain has lost all her colonies in South and Central America, though one common language bound them to the mother country.

Our own nation is still young and somewhat peculiar in its structure. It is composed of many discordant elements. In its veins pulsates the lifeblood of many peoples. Will this mass of foreigners, coming from every land and clime, speaking many languages, representing various races, and bringing with them views and habits not in harmony with our institutions, be permeated by our civilization and assimilated into our body politic? In other words, will they become good American citizens? That they may be so transformed is certainly the wish of every true patriot. What, then, are the best means to this end? Will it not be necessary to restrict these foreigners in the use of their native languages? Does not prudence dictate a course similar to that observed by the Czar of Russia toward the Poles and his German subjects in the Baltic

Provinces? Is the nation safe so long as half a dozen or more languages are spoken by the inhabitants in their homes and instruction is imparted to their children in those tongues, which, though dear to them, are nevertheless foreign to American soil? I answer with perfect assurance that no danger to the perpetuity of our institutions is likely ever to result from this cause. Without using coercion the assimilation of these heterogeneous masses will be accomplished in a peaceful manner in due time, and much more readily than most of us are willing to admit. For every one of these imported languages can, under the existing circumstances, have but a short life in this country. So long as immigrants do not form extended settlements, spreading over entire counties or States, there is no possibility in these days of rapid intercourse that they will intrench themselves to such an extent as to ward off the leavening influences of our intense national life. The railroad, the telegraph, and the public school are the great levelers. At present it would be simply impossible for any large body of foreigners to isolate themselves so completely from the rest of the community as did the Germans in the valleys of Pennsylvania a hundred years ago. Besides, parents who have the welfare of their children at heart will not prevent them from acquiring the English language, by means of which alone they can hope to rise to positions of influence and usefulness in their adopted country. Hence, if from feelings of reverence a large percentage of our naturalized fellow-citizens be prompted to bequeath to their offspring the language which they cannot but love because its tones have been music to them since infancy, we as a nation have morally no right to forbid this so long as these people help to support the public school and their attitude toward it is friendly. Even monarchical Germany is tolerant in matters pertaining to education. Though it compels parents to send their children to school, it allows them the choice between the public and the private institutions. It does not interfere with the consciences of its subjects. Nor should we as a free nation, who are proud of our liberal institutions, wish to interfere with what is sacred to every human being—his religion and his language.

As stated above, these foreign idioms can at best have but a short life among us. Even the German tongue, the prospects of

which are the fairest of all, will eventually die out on American soil unless immigration should continue unabated, which is not at all probable. This opinion is general among the Germans themselves. The children of parents who came across the ocean are learning English very rapidly. No power can prevent them from doing so. At the same time they are also becoming Americanized. Experience proves that already the second generation is more American in habits and modes of thinking than foreign, while the third generation, as a rule, has almost forgotten the language of its ancestors. No imported language can hereafter have such a hold on life as the German had in Pennsylvania and the French in Louisiana. The days of narrow provincialism and seclusion are forever past.

In conclusion, let the public school be supported and made accessible to all children; under no circumstances let there be any division of the school funds; let education be compulsory in every State; let the ability to read English be made a condition of citizenship, and the nation can consider itself safe so far as linguistic influences are concerned. The time will come when there will be but one language spoken in the homes throughout the land—the English. No human agency can prevent it. In the meanwhile, as the process of amalgamation is going on let all parties keep their temper and abstain from harsh and radical measures. If parents of foreign birth wish to send their children to private schools supported by themselves, where they can be instructed not only in the English language but also in those things which they consider necessary to spiritual welfare, let them do so. It is not prudent, generous, or in conformity with the spirit of our institutions, least of all is it necessary as an act of self-preservation, to prevent these parents from adopting such a course.

Victor Wilker.

ART. VII.—IDEAL COMMONWEALTHS.

THE great longing of humanity for an ideal condition of society in which each and all shall be entirely freed from evil and fixed in possessive enjoyment of all good is a fact known and read of all men. Expectation associates itself with desire. The twain constitute hope, of which the pleasing objective is always future and distant. "We are saved by hope" (Rom. viii, 24)—the force which moves the world and keeps all men busy, which in this checkered and troublous life evokes and invigorates all energies in the pursuit of fullest contentment, and which fortifies with invincible patience in the endurance of temporary suffering that shall be followed by eternal peace and gladness—the rest that remaineth for the people of God.

This longing for individual and social perfection is singularly connected with indistinct memories of such blessedness once enjoyed, but lost somehow in the misty long ago. Only in eldest oriental literature—Pentateuch and Hagiographa of Hebrew Semites—do they assume definite outlines. Genesis i and ii record the creation of man in the image of his Maker. The "breath of God and the dust of the earth," as Gregory Nazianzen remarks—the "immortal soul and mortal body" of Hermes Trismegistus—his very nature and constitution suggest the wondrous possibilities of his future (Gen. i, 28; Psalm viii, 5, 6; Job xxxii, 8) and the manifold felicities of his present,

From different natures marvelously mixed,
Connection exquisite of distant worlds.

Adam—man—is male and female; and this, the Hindoo version of creation says, through self-division of the Creator's "own substance, his mighty power." Scandinavian and Latin myths are to the same effect.

Eden, in which grew all that was pleasant and good and perpetuative of blissful life to its occupants (Gen. ii, 8, 9), is their assigned abode. The first of the four ages of the world, say the aboriginal Jains of Hindostan, is that in which men subsist on the fruit of ten celestial trees, are without kings, and "supremely happy." It corresponds with the golden age of the classic writers. The Zendavesta also records the great innocence and happiness of the primitive race in its elevated

residence. Hesiod, Greek father of didactic poetry, *circa* 900 B. C., in his *Works and Days* sings how

They lived of old,
When Saturn reigned in heaven, *an age of gold*.
Like gods they lived with calm, untroubled mind,
Free from the toil and anguish of our kind.

Ovid, the tuneful Latin genius, about A. D. 1, tells in his *Metamorphoses*, lib. i, that,

The golden age was first; when man, yet new,
No rule but uncorrupted reason knew,
And with a native bent did good pursue.
Unforced by punishment, unawed by fear,
His words were simple, and his soul sincere.
Needless was written law when none oppressed;
The law of man was written in his breast.
No suppliant crowds before the judge appeared,
No court erected yet, nor cause was heard,
But all was safe, for conscience was their guard.

Plato (*Politicus*) informs us that he had learned similar particulars from an ancient fable; and Dicæarchus, that the first men were of most excellent nature and lived most holy lives in universal felicity. The Satya age, or age of perfection, of the Brahmans was one of purity, plenty, philanthropy, praise, and prospect of celestial bliss when terrestrial probation expired.

What our race once was has left its traces in universal consciousness and world-wide literature. In primitive honor man did not abide. Genesis iii contains the tragic story of his fall, the promise of a redeemer, the expulsion from Eden, the hopelessness of return. Yet he has never wholly lost the memory of his former home. Tradition, fable, poetry, religion united to remind him of its simple happiness. The groves or the tree under which he worshiped recalled the refreshing coolness of paradisaal shades and the vitalizing fruit from the "tree of life" (Gen. xxi, 33; Exod. xxxiv, 13). The Phœnician colony at Gades, now Cadiz, worshiped Hercules under the title of σωτήρ, or saviour, in a delightful consecrated garden from which "calamity-causing" woman was excluded. In Epirus, in Campania, in the Hesperidean garden, in the Elysian fields of classic poetry, were kindred reminiscences of the forfeited Eden. Apollo, lover of men and destroyer of the serpent Python; the Hindoo Krishna, with eye of divine compassion on the dead

multitudes poisoned by the horrible serpent Kalli Nager, setting his foot on the many heads of the monster, overwhelming him in combat, and then banishing him into the abyss; the Scandinavian Thor, whose mighty mace bruises the head of the great serpent which he finally slays at the cost of his own life, are distorted but pathetic symbols of the "seed" of the woman who should bruise the serpent's head.

The insatiate craving for personal and corporate perfectness is vocal, all through the crowding centuries, in politico-economic debates and in the proposal and discussion of projects for social betterment. Neither selfishness nor oppression utterly stills its outcry. Selfishness avidly grasps and holds whatsoever it may, unscrupulously disregarding of the rights and wishes of others. It hungers for power, aggrandizement, and luxuriation. In least offensive form it embraces family, clan, and nation, and shuts out all not of either from the sweep of its sympathies, except as they may minister to its lusts. It is furtive, tyrannous, and cruel. Ever disappointed, it aches and schemes with the underlying conviction that there is a better way to compass its deepest desires. The oppressed are certain there is. They also may be selfish and unjust. Yet sad experience forces upon them the belief that equity and altruistic beneficence are indispensable to the welfare of each and the whole. History is a vividly crimson photograph of their struggles for the rightful enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and of reluctant concession on the part of privileged classes. Rome, France, Britain, and the United States of America are impressive illustrations. Through anguish, tears, and blood the people strive, by deliberate legislation, in which the need of infallible ethical guidance is touchingly confessed, to adjust relation to environment, to guard against recurrence of misery, and to reach that ideal constitution of society for which they purblindly yearn.

I. Imaginary constructions of society, built by basal, Edenic instinct and suited to the preferences of the architects, are among the choice treasures of literature. Plato, in his *Republic*, argues that it is the aim of the individual man, and also of the State, to be wise, brave, and temperate. In the State, he says, there are the three orders of guardians, auxiliaries, and producers. Of these wisdom is the special virtue of the first,

courage of the second, and temperance of all. As to the individual, wisdom belongs to his rational part, courage to his spirited, and temperance to his appetitive. In the State, as in the man, injustice disturbs their harmony. Socrates wished that he could see how such a commonwealth would work if once set in motion, but died without the sight.

II. Plutarch, writing near the close of the first century after Christ, painted an ideal commonwealth as the concentered conception of Lycurgus, the mythical Solon of Sparta. Chivalrously loyal to the right, and zealous chiefly for the health and strength of his native city, this noblest of the Heraclidæ studied the science and art of government in Crete, hygiene and Homer's poems in Ionia, and military organization in Egypt. Summoned by the Lacedæmonians to Sparta, and distinguished by the priestess of Apollo at Delphi as "beloved of the gods, and rather a god than a man," he remodeled the government by the institution of a senate of equal authority with the kings, which, while it tempered their imperiousness, also curbed the encroaching disposition of the people. He also introduced the *referendum*, or submission of legislation to the vote of the people for adoption or rejection, and rooted out the evils of insolence, envy, avarice, and luxury, and also those distempers of a State still more inveterate and fatal—poverty and riches—"by the cancellation of all former divisions of the land and the making of new ones, so that all might be perfectly equal in their possessions and way of living." Thenceforward those ambitious of distinction might seek it in virtue only. Next Lycurgus attempted to divide the movables, but was checked by an avarice which he circumvented by the substitution of iron for gold and silver money. This also helped him in the extrusion of unprofitable and superfluous arts. Commerce ended for lack of portable currency, and so did the traffic in lust, superstition, and vanity. But this loss was compensated by excellence of art in necessary things. Public tables—at which all ate in common of the same meat, and of such kinds as were appointed by law—completed the conquest of luxury and love of riches. The *menu* was not like Delmonico's. Each of fifteen persons at a table supplied monthly one bushel of meal, eight gallons of wine, five pounds of cheese, two and one half pounds of figs, and a little money to buy fish and flesh.

Lycurgus, himself an example of meekness and sterling morality, observed all his own ordinances. Children were introduced as into schools of sobriety and instructed in government, liberal breeding, and reticence.

Lycurgus published neither organic nor statutory laws in writing, but interwove their principles with the manners and culture of the citizens. Habit became common law. Frequent aggression upon the same enemy was inhibited, lest they too should become able warriors. Legislation was resolved into the education of youth. This was begun before the marriage of parents in physical training, in unquestionably immoral public exhibitions of dancing virgins, and in the incitement of young men who beheld the spectacle to matrimony. Lycurgus was the primal scientific stirpiculturist, and only less obnoxious to sound morals in his institution of abductive matrimony and illicit commerce of the sexes than John H. Noyes in the noisome Oneida Community. Children he regarded as less the property of their parents than of the State. If weakly and deformed, they were thrown into a deep cavern near Mount Taygetus. If vigorous and hardy, they were taught to despise fear, ill-humor, and crying. At seven years of age they were enrolled into companies and encouraged to fight with spirited firmness. At twelve they slept on beds of reeds, with a little thistledown added to the single garment of each to keep him warm in winter. Theft was the deft art that saved from starvation, and death was preferred to detection. Quick wit, sharp repartee seasoned with humor, concise and pithy speech, were *desiderata*. "And yet we can reach our enemies' hearts with them," was the defense of short swords by Agis. "Go and first make trial of it in thy own family," was the advice that voiced the objection of Lycurgus to popular government. He fortified Sparta with "a wall of men instead of brick." Poetry and music were equally laconic after their kind. Only in campaigns were the Spartans dudish in costume, indulgent in diet, and gentle in discipline. Men of mature years lived not for themselves, but for their country. None could exercise any mechanic trade; that was devolved upon the enslaved Helots. Contempt of the worthless, faciousness, public spirit, ambition to be wisest and best among the good and wise, and intense patriotism were prominent characteristics;



and so was the cowardly practice of ambuscading and murdering the defenseless Helots.

Stern beauty and greatness undoubtedly inhered in this hypothetical government; ugliness and littleness were no less distinctive of it. Gold and silver were in the statue, but clay was the largest component. "Rather by the obedience of subjects" than by the rule of kings did Sparta endure for a while. The diabolism of cruelest selfishness was in its relations to the enslaved; nor was this vice altogether absent from commerce among themselves and their attitude toward their compeers. As a philosophic dream this unique commonwealth is of abiding interest; as a concrete working theory of the way in which humanity may achieve its highest evolution and deepest satisfaction it is a wretched failure. Yet it is the best that philosophic heathenism could produce.

III. Vastly better in ethics, structure, and results, because of the incorporation of professedly Christian elements, is the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More, written in the years 1515-16, when the rickety edifice of Roman Catholicism in the British Isles was crumbling into ruins. The disorders of the times compelled thought on meliorative methods and on the discrepancy between what was and what ought to be. This *brochure* represents ideal society, as imagined by the author and described by the sage traveler, Raphael Hythloday. The commonwealth of Utopia was in startling contrast with that of England. The veiled mockery of its description precluded publication while Henry VIII lived. Erasmus commended the perusal of it as acquainting with the true source of all political evils.

Utopia—"nowhere"—is said to be a crescent-shaped island five hundred miles in shore length and two hundred miles broad in the middle, situated somewhere south of the equator. It is a beautiful and fertile land whose principal inhabitants are very unlike a great number of noblemen in England, "that are themselves as idle as drones, that insist on other men's labor, on the labor of their tenants, whom, to raise their revenues, they pare to the quick," and thus drive into the menacing standing army or cast out into the highways; where, perforce, they became desperate criminals in such numbers that the groaning gibbets could scarcely sustain the bodies of those condemned to death. These same noblemen (essentially unchanged at the close of the

nineteenth century) estopped agriculture, razed houses and towns to make pasturage, and, by ill usage, forced small freeholders to sell their acres and household goods at bankrupt prices. Sports, gambling, and drunkenness only aggravated the general distress. Religion and worship were matters of kingly caprice. The brutal Tudor would tolerate none of any kind differing from that which he professed. Dissent was crushed by imprisonment, torture, confiscation, and death. He was Church and State in one, and over both his will—variable as his foul lusts—held supreme sway. Sir Thomas More himself fell a victim to Henry's ferocious tyranny; yet not before he had accomplished, by the composition of *Utopia*, a work whose actual social energy will be lasting as his own brilliant memory. In it the lust of conquest, burdensome standing armies, debasement of the currency, iniquitous taxation, dispensing with legal inhibitions for great compositions, mercenary judiciary, divine right of kings to do as they please, religious bigotry and persecution, and avoidable poverty are all denounced with exquisite irony and resistless force. For much of all this evil aggregate the preachers, who should have publicly proclaimed what Christ taught in secret, are severely blamed. They displayed the craft of Machiavelian politicians; "for they, observing that the world would not willingly suit their lives to the rules that Christ has given, have fitted his doctrine as if it had been a leaden rule to their lives, that so, some way or other, they might agree with one another." It was different with the Utopians, "among whom all things were so well governed, and with so few laws; where virtue hath its due reward, and yet there is such an equality that every man lives in plenty."

More in this famous study figures as a Christian socialist, who sees that "the setting all upon a level is the only way to make a nation happy, which cannot be obtained as long as there is private property." Whence, he is persuaded that "till property is taken away there can be no equitable or just distribution of things, nor can the world be happily governed; for as long as that is maintained the greatest and far best part of mankind will be still oppressed with a load of cares and anxieties." To this end he would limit the acquisitions of wealth and prevent the establishment of government by the rich and for the rich, with all its concomitant evils.

His ideas of civil government are embodied in the constitution of Utopia, each of whose fifty-four cities annually sends three of its wisest senators to Amaurot, the capital, to consult about their common concerns. Its organization is of geometrical precision. Citizens reside in town and country alternately. Country families are of not less than forty persons, "besides two slaves," and over every thirty families is a magistrate. Husbandmen are model farmers and raise "an infinite multitude of chickens" by artificial incubation. Amaurot is an equalized Philadelphia, with narrow streets, uniform buildings, flat roofs, and fruitful rear gardens. Every thirty families yearly choose a magistrate called the philarch, every ten philarchs an archphilarch, and all the philarchs or syphogrants the prince. The latter is chosen secretly, on the ground of special fitness for office, and for life. The archphilarchs, or tranibors, are his legislative council, and debate every public measure for three days before reaching a conclusion. Nothing is debated on the day it is proposed. They sleep before discussing it, and thus avoid hasty and ill-considered decisions.

All the Utopians are workers. Every family makes its own clothes; trades pass generally by descent; six hours *per diem* are allotted to work, eight to sleep, and ten to study and recreation. All have abundant provision, for there is neither idleness nor luxury among them. Mental and æsthetic culture is rich, varied, and thorough. Learned men are exempt from manual labor and furnish national ambassadors to foreign powers. Surplus laborers are sent out to mend the highways, and thus to perfect the means of intercommunication. "Great obedience" to parents is a common trait. Swarming population is colonized in foreign nations claiming more soil than is cultivated, whether the natives consent thereto or not. "since every man has by the law of nature a right to such a waste portion of the earth as is necessary for his subsistence"—a *dictum* dear to the heart of Henry George. Wives serve their husbands, children their parents, "and always the younger serves the elder." As in Bellamy's new Boston, every family is supplied at the public stores with what it needs, "without either paying for it or leaving anything in exchange." This is as it ought to be, for there is enough for all, and the Rev. Dr. McGlynn agrees with Sir Thomas More, that it is "the fear of want

that makes any of the whole race of animals either greedy or ravenous." Markets are public. In the extramural abattoirs killing is done by slaves. Repasts in the public halls are common. The sick and injured are lodged and cared for in public hospitals like Bellevue, and those ill of infectious diseases are isolated in buildings like those of North Brother's Island or Sandy Hook, so that there is no danger of spreading contagion. Slaves perform all uneasy and sordid services. The sexes are seated opposite to each other at the public tables, and separate tables accommodate children and nurses. Old men are held in special honor, and entertain while they educate juniors by their talk. Proficients in the fine art of feeding, "they never sup without music, and there is always fruit served up after meat. While they are at table some burn perfumes and sprinkle about fragrant ointments and sweet waters; in short, they want nothing that may cheer up their spirits. They give themselves a large allowance that way, and indulge themselves in all such pleasures as are attended with no inconvenience."

Liberty of movement is regulated by law, no mercy is shown to tramps, and "there are no taverns, no alehouses, nor stews among them"—a condition of things that the Rev. Dr. Parkhurst and all good prohibitionists would be glad to witness in the city of New York. Surplus in one part of the island supplements scarcity in another. Wealth, represented by bonds of foreign communities, is Utopian property with which mercenaries are hired in foreign warfare. Gold, silver, and precious stones find uses in the arts, as playthings for children, and as badges of slavery and marks of infamy.

Of trifling logical forms the Utopians know nothing, but of astronomy and the exact sciences they know much. Moral philosophy evokes all their mental powers. Man's happiness, they say, is chiefly, if not wholly, in pleasure; and this they prove by arguments drawn from the principles of religion, as well as from natural reason—but the pleasure must always be good and honest. The religious principles held by them are such as might be taught in all the public schools of modern civilization, namely, the being and government of God, the immortality of the soul, happiness the end of being, personal responsibility to God, and rewards and punishments in and after this life. Self-love is the principle that measures the treatment

of others. Hence the Utopians are courteous, wise, humane, intellectual, pious, and upright. Health is prized as the greatest of bodily pleasures, and the "witness of a good conscience" as the highest of all mental delights. They are scholarly, erudite, critical, and cosmopolitan in knowledge.

Slaves are prisoners captured in battle, criminals, or voluntary hirelings. All, by good and faithful works, may earn freedom. Death is not feared, but is often sought in economic suicide. Uncleanliness is condignly punished, marriage fostered, and uncommon—if not indecent—pains taken to ascertain the perfect healthfulness of both parties to the contract. Divorce is granted only because of insufferable perverseness or adultery, in which latter case both parties to the crime are doomed to slavery. Capital punishment is not practiced, nor do penalties fail to be graduated by the nature and circumstances of offenses. Positive purpose to commit crime is punishable as the crime itself. Love of virtue is stimulated by public honors, and aspiration to office is frustrated by certain defeat. Of lawyers, considering them "as a sort of people whose profession it is to disguise matters and to wrest the laws," they have none. Every man, as his own lawyer, is supposed to know his duty. In international relations "they think leagues are useless things, and believe that if the common ties of humanity do not knit men together the faith of promises will have no great effect." Wars are waged only for the redress of overt or covert wrongs, and in these wars women are trained to take part in case of necessity. All warriors are volunteers. Retaliation primarily takes the form of embargo on trade, and never of violence more than sufficient to enforce justice. Peace is won and maintained by subsidizing friends among the enemy. Intrenchments, bayonets, masked batteries, and godly chaplains are favorite instruments in active operations. The least injury possible is done to the property of enemies, whose country is made the seat of war and who are compelled to reimburse expenses by payment of indemnity as one of the terms of peace.

Religions are many, widely differentiated, and equal before the law. All the Utopians are theists in process of emancipation from superstition, and most are Christian socialists. Religious profession and worship are free, ministers of religion are possessed of authority conferred simultaneously with

providential call to work, and atheists are never raised "either to honor or offices," or employed "in any public trust." The citizens think, as John Wesley was inclined to do, that "the souls of beasts are immortal," burn the bodies of their fellow-men, and believe that the spirits of the good may be and are in our company. They despise auguries and scorn divination; are practical brothers and sisters of charity (*Brutheskas*) and the widest of broad churchmen. In church theory and administration they resemble the Methodist Episcopalians, impart accurate ethical instruction to children, and utilize the services of women as "deaconesses" and even as ordained priests. All of both sexes in the latter class enjoy the "benefit of clergy." Worship is by the sexes seated apart, and is confessional, supplicative, and thankful. Symbolism is of purely spiritual things, and Sabbath observance of the best Roman Catholic type.

While More regards Utopia as the only commonwealth that truly deserves the name, there are many things in it that he rather wishes than hopes to see adopted in government. Could he have lived to the present hour he would be amazed and exultant over the extent to which his *Utopia* adumbrated the future. It is one of the books of the ages—wonderfully influential on faith and morals. It initiates the movements that issue in religious and civil freedom, in the reform of criminal law, and in public provision for the poor when disabled from further labor. Yet, deeper study of another volume, from whose inspired pages he drew whatever is potential of good in his own, and the application of its teachings to individual and collective life will work out far greater marvels, marvels that will wholly satisfy the indestructible yearning of humanity for perfection of personal and social being.

IV. Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*, published in 1629, posits his ideal commonwealth in the seas wherein Australia now exults in the flush of political youth. He presents science as the civilizer which binds man to man and as the leader of all ages, ranks, and classes into the knowledge and love of God. The *New Atlantis* is painted as a glorious island—Bensalem by native title—tenanted by godly Christians who are familiar with religious oaths, quarantine, hospitals, and hospitality, addicted to wholesome and generous diet, and still more conspicuously to the "study of the works and creatures of God." For the latter

they have an order called Salomon's House—"the noblest foundation that ever was upon the earth, and the lantern of this kingdom"—whose members seek exhaustive knowledge of the affairs and state of all countries, and "especially of the sciences, arts, manufactures, and inventions of all the world;" the end of their foundation being the "knowledge of causes and secret motions of things and the enlarging of the bounds of human empire, to the effecting of all things possible." What the "father of Salomon's House" enumerates as the preparations for, and instruments and achievements of, scientific research are those best known to the profound writer, who believed in the transmutation of species and also in perpetual motion. Bacon never finished his volume. What he has done is to give his readers a grave and imposing representation of an extremely pious nation of scientists, philosophers, artisans, and artists, who implored divine illumination upon their labors for "turning them into good and holy uses," and who thought that purely religious life developed the highest civilization.

V. Thomas Campanella, Bacon's compeer, was an Italian Dominican with eager appetite for knowledge. He thought that nature should be studied in her works rather than through books. His patriotism cost him twenty-seven years' imprisonment by the King of Spain. During this period he constructed his *Civitas Solis*, or City of the Sun. This is located in Taprobane, or Ceylon, and is built in seven concentric circles upon a high hill crowned by a skillfully artistic temple. The head of its government in temporal and spiritual affairs is Metaphysic: his assistants are Power, Wisdom, and Love. The first is the military ruler, the second presides over the liberal arts and sciences, the third is in charge of the people. The Virtues are the magistrates. Property is in common; so are the public tables and the women. Children are for the State. All are told off to work for about four hours every day. None are rich or poor, for all have enough; "and on this point they strongly recommend the religion of the Christians, and especially the life of the apostles." In war the citizens of *Civitas Solis* are just, brave, expert, and pious; in peace temperate, cleanly, and long-lived. Capital punishment is for treason or impiety. Laws are short and plain. Being superstitious astrologists, they hold many absurd notions, and in prayer ex-

press submission to the divine will, "as it seems best to God." Campanella's creation is of the same class as that of Bacon. It is a scheme of society projected by a solitary celibate scholar, who seems to have known less of Christ's teachings than of those of the philosophers. It reveals the precedent environment of the author, and shows, like all its predecessors, the tokens of outgrowth from that gnawing, unrestful desire for symmetrical and perfect being and for the individual and collective happiness, once possessed but now lost, for which humanity instinctively feels that it was made.

VI. This same desire has been and is operative in the establishment of socialistic communities on a smaller scale, of which we have so many examples in the United States, and grieves over their total or comparative failure. Many of these were organized by men of powerful intellect, like Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, and John H. Noyes, who liberally contributed to carry out their respective schemes. Owen devoted \$300,000 of his private fortune to make his enterprise successful, and Saint-Simon sacrificed a brilliant career in the army. Great emphasis has been placed by the majority on the importance of universal education. Celibacy, as with the Shakers, has been an essential element in some of their systems; marriage, as with the Icarians, in others; and promiscuous intercourse, as with the communities at Oneida and Wallingford, in others. All are failures. Noyes, in his book on *American Socialisms*, gives a short history of no less than forty-seven. All the Communists in the United States number about five thousand, including children. In 1878 the whole were divided into seventy-two separate communities, each with an average of less than seventy persons. The aggregate capitalized wealth possessed by them was estimated by Charles Nordhoff at \$12,000,000 (now about \$20,000,000), and yet they are disheartening failures to the projectors. Brook Farm, in Massachusetts, founded by men and women distinguished for education and refinement, was a total failure. All others are either total or comparative failures. The undertakings of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Bazard, and Enfantin, in France, were tragic failures. So were those of Owen in England, and so have been the phalansteries of the Fourierians in this country. Bitter have been the despairing lamentations over the whole.

VII. Is, then, this irrepressible desire for fully rounded bliss

to flame forever in the burning heart of humanity? Is there no hope of satisfaction? Profound and eager thinkers, philanthropists, and men of push and pluck reply strenuously in the negative. They stand ready to repeat, in newer forms, the daring experimentation of their predecessors. Like coral insects, building up the reef that eventually will rise above the waves to be kissed by the sun, fertilized by the flora, and converted into semblance of paradise, so these are content to aim and toil and die without attaining the objective of exertion, but hopeful that successors, building on the results of their lives, will justify the wisdom of their deeds and sacrifices. Of this resourceful and daring class Dr. Theodor Hertzka, a leading Viennese economist, and author of *Freeland—A Social Anticipation*, is an example. His publication immediately evoked desire in Germany and Austria to put his views into practice. In many of the large towns and cities persons of all classes organized local societies for this purpose, and these have been united under the title of the International Freeland Society. At the first plenary meeting of this body in March, 1891, it was announced that a suitable tract of land in British East Africa, between Mount Kenia and the coast, had been placed at its disposal. It was hoped that the actual formation of a Freeland colony would not be delayed long, and the intention was to apply to the British government for the guarantee of non-interference with the development of Freeland institutions.

Freeland is a purely secularistic attempt to solve the darkest problem of modern times in the world's economic and social order. 'Splendid advances of art and science have brought the unlimited forces of nature into subjection, production is of inexhaustible abundance, and yet not a single human woe has been mitigated. At least John Stuart Mill says so. Increasing facility in the production of wealth brings misery and ruin in its train. Science hitherto has stood helpless and perplexed in presence of this hard problem, whose solution, according to Dr. Hertzka, has been sought in a wrong direction :

The solution of the social problem is not to be sought in the discovery of an *absolutely good* order of society, but in that of the *relatively best* ; that is, of such an order of human institutions as best corresponds to the temporary conditions of human existence. The existing arrangements of society call for improvement, not because they are out of harmony with our longing for an abso-

lutely good state of things, but because it can be shown to be possible to *replace* them by others more in accordance with the contemporary conditions of human existence.

What these other possible arrangements of society may be is exhibited in the history and progress of the imaginary Free-land republic, established "on the basis of perfect liberty and economic justice; a community which, while it preserves the unqualified right of every individual to control his own actions, secures to every worker the full and uncurtailed enjoyment of the fruits of his labor." Central Africa, with its genial climate, rich and unappropriated lands, and manifold resources, is selected for the location of the colony. The composite colonists are duly settled therein. Exclusive right of property in occupied land is not recognized, either in the individual or in the community. For agriculture and for productive purposes generally self-governing associations are formed, of which each member shares the profits in proportion to his contribution to the common labor of the body. Anyone may join any association and may leave it when he pleases. Action is freely permitted so long as it does not infringe upon the rights of others. Capital for production, without payment of interest, is furnished to producers out of the common revenue, but must be returned by the producer. All persons incapable of labor, and also women, have the right to a competent allowance for maintenance out of the revenue of the commonwealth, which "belongs as much to the weak and helpless as to the strong and capable." Public revenue for all purposes is provided by a tax levied upon net income.

Space precludes more than the briefest glances at the romantic expedition which inaugurates this new arrangement of social order. It is amply provided with necessary material; is reinforced by the accession of an American lady, rich and beautiful, young and practical; obeys the orders of its leader with military precision; defeats and conciliates hostile natives; and reaches its goal at the feet of "Kenia in all the icy magnificence of its glacier world." Eden Vale is chosen as the new home. Agriculturists, artisans, mechanics, and miners soon make it a commodious, wealthy, and happy abode. Roads are constructed, and the colony's steamer service brings in multitudinous immigrants. Elephants and buffaloes are converted into beasts of burden and domestic cattle. Public officials are legislative and

administrative. Adult suffrage, without discrimination of sex, is universal. Of business secrets there are none. The contribution of each citizen to public purposes is in proportion to his income. Education is liberal, without cost to pupils, and teachers are highly paid. Exploitation of and injustice to labor are unknown. Canals, aqueducts, and railroads of immense length and usefulness are thoroughly constructed. Gold from native mines is plentiful, is the measure of value in foreign commerce, and also in domestic exchanges, wherein it is represented only by checks and written orders. All the conveniences and luxuries of Bellamy's future Boston are at command of the happy Freelanders. Its science, philosophy, art, literature are equaled by those of the African republic. Drunkards are few, and always of the newcomers. War with the aggressive Abyssinians quickly ends in the rout of the latter. Army and navy of the Freelanders are fearless and irresistible. Both sexes are at liberty to smoke, and women free to court mates for themselves. Sunday is a day for singing and dancing—not religiously, however. Care is an utter stranger, for all “possess the absolute certainty of continuing to be well off.”

Other nations seek counsel from Freeland on the modification of their own institutions, and with a view to similar prosperity. Therefore a representative congress of all nations is invited to assemble at Eden Vale. Sixty-eight accept the invitation. In the six days of discussion that ensue all exemplify the catholic longing for perfection of nature and of bliss. Some insist that it can be realized only through obedience to the instructions and imitation of the example of Jesus of Nazareth, that he is the ideal social reformer, and that “Christ rejected wealth only because it had its source in exploitation.” Opponents concede that his teaching differs in no essential point from that which is practically carried out in Freeland, and wish to make it the common property of the world. The debate is a symposium of advanced opinions on economic and political questions. Christ is honored as the great Teacher, whose instructions have been and still are woefully misunderstood and misapplied. Not with all things that are said of him can his evangelical disciples fully agree, but with the conclusion that only in and through him Edenic conditions can be restored to the individual and to the mass of society they are in entire accord.

VIII. This pathetic, restless aspiration for perfect goodness of being and relation is to be satisfied in a future beyond secular time. Dr. Hertzka is right in the confident opinion that "we are standing on the threshold of a new and happier age." But, whatever of nearest approximation to the highest ultimate possibilities of our race that new and happier age may bring, it will be only the prophecy and providential pledge of the new heavens and earth in which dwelleth righteousness. Imperfection, sickness, death, will continue until Christ shall make all things new. Then nature and character will be perfect and felicity complete. Christian expectancy will be more than satisfied. The Creator never implanted desires for good in the Adamic heart without making provision for their legitimate gratification—

Indulging every instinct of the soul,
There where law, life, joy, impulse, are one thing.

The recent marvelous progress of society—through seasons of darkness, convulsion, pain, and grief—toward possible perfection is presumptive proof that the ultimate goal will be finally won. The infinite Father, by revelation of his mind and will through the long series of apostles and prophets, and more particularly through his incarnate Son, lovingly guides humanity in intelligent working toward the desired consummation. Approximation toward it is commensurate with the degree of personal and collective cooperation with the Father as revealed in Christ. How this is so cannot be discussed within the limits of this essay. Suffice it to say here that the kingdom of Messiah, or the ideal commonwealth, has been inaugurated for more than nineteen centuries, has slowly but surely spread throughout the earth, is winning more benignant victories than in any prior era, and is conferring the richest blessings upon mankind.

Richard Wheatley,

ART. VIII.—AN OLD POLITICAL SCANDAL—WERE
CLAY AND ADAMS GUILTY OF BARGAIN AND
INTRIGUE?

THE presidential election of 1824 was marked by many peculiar features. In the first place, all four of the candidates belonged to the same political party. They were Jeffersonian Republicans, or, as we should now call them, Democrats. The old Federalist Party of Washington, Hamilton, and John Adams had not been able to survive the suspicion of unpatriotic conduct which tainted its reputation during the War of 1812, though in Pennsylvania and a few of the other States it still managed to keep up a show of life.

In the second place, there was no uniformity as to the manner in which the candidates were brought out. For twenty years prior to that time it had been customary for the members of the federal Congress to resolve themselves into nominating conventions and to recommend suitable persons for the suffrages of their fellow-citizens. This custom, however, had gradually come to be very unpopular. The great body of the people, growing more and more democratic in their instincts and impulses, had reached the point at which they resented the idea of allowing "King Caucus," as the congressional conclave was derisively called, to determine who should be the nation's ruler. The last effort to use this once formidable "machine" was made February 14, 1824; but out of the two hundred and sixteen Republican congressmen who were entitled to be present only sixty-six actually availed themselves of the privilege. The rest were prudent men who foresaw the evil and hid themselves. The chief of the caucus managers was Martin Van Buren, who was by native instinct and acquired habit a trading politician. On his motion, and in the face of some slight demand for adjournment to another day, Mr. William H. Crawford, of Georgia, Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Monroe, was nominated, receiving sixty-four of the total number of

NOTE.—In preparing this article, the author acknowledges indebtedness to Schurz's admirable biography of Henry Clay; to Parton's *Life of Andrew Jackson*; to Roosevelt's *Thomas H. Benton*; and, on disputed points, to Stiles's *Register*, 1830, which is an original authority of the greatest value.

votes cast. Carl Schurz, in his *Life of Henry Clay*, measures Crawford thus :

He was a man of imposing presence. He had filled several public stations of importance creditably enough, but in none of them had he rendered services so eminent as to entitle him to rank among the first order of statesmen. Still, he had managed to pass in those days as a great man. His was that temporary sort of greatness that appears in history as the reputation of a reputation.

As early as 1822 the Tennessee Legislature had put forward the name of General Andrew Jackson, that genuine son of Mars, who won immortal fame at the battle of New Orleans. This action created much merriment in the northeastern section of the country. But when, in the spring of 1824, it was indorsed by both the Federalists and the Republicans of Pennsylvania, it ceased to be regarded as a joke. In the meantime the legislatures of Kentucky, Louisiana, Ohio, and Missouri had declared for Henry Clay—"Harry of the West," as he was admirably called by his loyal followers—the most fascinating and best loved man that ever figured in American politics. New England and the Northeast generally favored the candidacy of John Quincy Adams, whose qualifications lay in his unrivaled scholarship, his long experience as a statesman and diplomatist, and his unbending integrity; but who utterly lacked the personal qualities that draw and hold the masses.

The canvass that followed was most exciting and quite as abusive as any of more recent years. It early became evident that there would be no choice by the Electoral College; but this fact did not restrain the activity of the partisans of the various candidates. From the beginning Jackson gained on his competitors; and it is possible that if the election had been postponed for a few weeks he would have been chosen in the ordinary way. The exact result was not known until late in December. It turned out that Mr. Clay had received 37 electoral votes; Mr. Crawford, 41; Mr. Adams, 84; General Jackson, 99.

For the second time in the history of the republic, the choice of the chief magistrate devolved upon the House of Representatives. Of that body Henry Clay had been the speaker for thirteen years, and had demeaned himself with so much dignity, courtesy, and ability that no one of his official rulings had ever been reversed. His influence over his fellow-members was

very great. It was felt on all hands that he would, nevertheless—though he himself, not being one of the three foremost candidates, was now constitutionally ineligible—easily be able to play the part of a Warwick and name the successful man. Assiduous court was consequently paid him from every quarter. In a letter written from Washington on January 8, 1825, to Francis P. Blair, Sr., whom he then counted among his friends in Kentucky, he humorously describes the situation thus :

I am sometimes touched gently on the shoulder by a friend, for example, of General Jackson, who will thus address me : “ My dear sir, all my dependence is upon you ; don’t disappoint us ; you know our partiality was for you next to the hero, and how much we want a Western President.” Immediately after a friend of Mr. Crawford will accost me : “ The hopes of the Republican Party are concentrated on you ; for God’s sake preserve it. If you had been returned instead of Mr. Crawford every man of us would have supported you to the last hour. We consider you and him as the only genuine Republican candidates.” Next a friend of Mr. Adams comes with tears in his eyes : “ Sir, Mr. Adams has always had the greatest respect for you and admiration of your talents. There is no station to which you are not equal. Most undoubtedly you are the second choice of New England, and I pray you to consider seriously whether the public good and your own future interests do not point most distinctly to the choice which you ought to make.” How can one withstand all this disinterested homage and kindness ?

All these pains might have been spared. Mr. Clay’s mind was already made up as to what he should do. Even before he left Kentucky for the capital he had told John J. Crittenden that he was resolved to vote for Mr. Adams ; and early in December he had communicated the same information to Colonel Thomas H. Benton, who up to that time had been his ardent supporter. Not long after he wrote to Francis Brooke :

As a friend of liberty, and to the permanence of our institutions, I cannot consent, in this early stage of their existence, by contributing to the election of a military chieftain, to give the strongest guaranty that the republic will march in the fatal road which has conducted every other republic to ruin.

In the same strain he addressed Mr. Blair :

Mr. Adams, you know well, I should never have selected, if at liberty to draw from the whole mass of our citizens, for a President. But there is no danger in his elevation now, or in time to come. Not so of his competitor, of whom I cannot believe that killing

two thousand five hundred Englishmen at New Orleans qualifies for the various difficult and complicated duties of the chief magistracy.

These were not new views, originated by Mr. Clay to meet the occasion and to justify a questionable piece of conduct. They had been formed and expressed as far back as the time when he delivered his speech in Congress on General Jackson's lawless conduct in the Seminole war. It is not strange, therefore, that he declined to be governed by the action which the Kentucky Legislature presently took, requesting the members of Congress from the State to give their support to General Jackson. He had not been elected by the Legislature, and felt no responsibility to it. Perhaps, also, he entertained the same general opinion on the subject of instructions that, at a later day, led Mr. Lamar to stand up in the Senate chamber and vote for honest money in the teeth of a command from the Legislature of Mississippi to do otherwise.

When Mr. Clay's purpose became generally known the adherents of Mr. Crawford and of General Jackson utterly changed their attitude toward him. Finding they could not cajole, they undertook to frighten him; and at the last they had resort to an expedient of the most desperate character. On January 28 the following letter, purporting to have been written by a member of Congress from Pennsylvania, was published in the *Columbian Observer* of Philadelphia:

WASHINGTON, January 25, 1825.

DEAR SIR: I take up my pen to inform you of one of the most disgraceful transactions that ever covered with infamy the Republican ranks. Would you believe that men professing democracy could be found base enough to lay the ax at the very root of the tree of liberty! Yet, strange as it is, it is not less true. To give you a full history of this transaction would far exceed the limits of a letter. I shall, therefore, at once proceed to give you a brief account of such a bargain as can only be equaled by the famous Burr conspiracy of 1801. For some time past the friends of Clay have hinted that they, like the Swiss, would fight for those who pay best. Overtures were said to have been made by the friends of Adams to the friends of Clay, offering him the appointment of Secretary of State for his aid to elect Adams. And the friends of Mr. Clay gave the information to the friends of Jackson, and hinted that if the friends of Jackson would offer the same price they would close with them. But none of the friends of Jackson would descend to such mean barter and sale. It was not believed

by any of the friends of Jackson that this contract would be ratified by the members from the States which had voted for Clay. I was of the opinion, when I first heard of this transaction, that men professing any honorable principles could not, or would not, be transferred like the planter does his negroes or the farmer does his team of horses. No alarm was excited. We believed the republic was safe. The nation having delivered Jackson into the hands of Congress backed by a large majority of their votes, there was in my mind no doubt that Congress would respond to the will of the nation by electing the individual they had declared to be their choice.* Contrary to this expectation, it is now ascertained to a certainty that Henry Clay has transferred his interests to John Quincy Adams. As a consideration for this abandonment of duty to his constituents, it is said and believed, should this unholy coalition prevail, Clay is to be appointed Secretary of State. I have no fear on my mind. I am clearly of opinion we shall defeat every combination. The force of public opinion must prevail, or there is an end of liberty.

This rather lengthy document we give in full because no condensation could do it justice. In the *National Intelligencer* of February 1 Mr. Clay made a brief and stinging reply :

I have seen without any other emotion than that of ineffable contempt the abuse which has been poured upon me by a scurrilous paper published in this city, and by other kindred prints and persons, in regard to the presidential election. The editor of one of these prints, ushered forth in Philadelphia, called the *Columbian Observer*, for which I do not subscribe, and which I have never ordered, has had the impudence to transmit to me his vile paper of the 28th inst. In this number is inserted a letter, purporting to have been written from this city on the 25th inst. by a member of the House of Representatives belonging to the Pennsylvania delegation. I believe it to be a forgery ; but if it be genuine I pronounce the member, whoever he may be, a base and infamous calumniator, a dastard and liar ; and if he dare unveil himself and avow his name I will hold him responsible, as I here admit myself to be, to all the laws which govern and regulate men of honor.

The flourish in the last sentence about holding his unknown calumniator "responsible" meant, as everybody knew, an invitation to a duel. It sounds very ridiculous in our ears ; but it seemed proper enough to our fathers fifty years ago. Dueling is, of course, a miserable anachronism ; it was always a flagrant offense against good sense and good morals.

* The cool falsehood in this claim of a "majority" for General Jackson is amazing even in such a document.

On February 3 the capitol city was convulsed with inextinguishable laughter; for on that day Mr. George Kremer, an eccentric, ignorant, and uncouth member from Pennsylvania, whose chief distinction lay in the fact that he wore a curious old leopard-skin overcoat, avowed himself the author of the offensive contribution in the *Columbian Observer*, and added:

In the meantime George Kremer holds himself ready to prove, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds, enough to satisfy them of the accuracy of the statements which are contained in that letter, to the extent that they concern the course and conduct of H. Clay.

To have challenged Kremer would have been absurd. Daniel Webster wrote to his brother Ezekiel: "Mr. Kremer is a man with whom one would think of having a shot about as soon as with your neighbor, Mr. Simeon Atkinson, whom he somewhat resembles." Clay saw that he had committed an egregious and ridiculous blunder in making a premature announcement of his bellicose intentions. He felt that for the time he was legitimate game for public amusement, and that the best he could do was to recover his position with the utmost possible dignity. He therefore on the same day arose in his place in the House and asked for an immediate and searching investigation into the truth or falsity of the charges that had been brought against him, and said that, emanating from such a source as they did, this was the only notice which he could take of them. After a debate of a day and a half a committee of seven, Messrs. Barbour, Webster, MacLane, Taylor, Forsyth, Saunders, and Rankin, was appointed. Kremer promptly professed his willingness "to meet the inquiry and abide the result." But he subsequently refused to appear before the committee, and sent instead a rambling document, claiming that he was responsible only to his constituents, and affirming that he would vindicate his integrity before "another tribunal." It was evident that he was a mere puppet in the hands of abler men, who had promised to furnish him with the necessary evidence to sustain his accusations against Mr. Clay, but were utterly unable to redeem their pledge. The probabilities are that his first letter was written by Senator John H. Eaton, of Tennessee, and his last by Samuel D. Ingham, of Pennsylvania. His recalcitrancy, of course, estopped investigation, and the committee reported that they could take no further steps.

One week later Mr. Adams was elected by the House of Representatives, receiving the votes of thirteen States. Three of these States, Kentucky, Ohio, and Missouri, had cast their electoral votes for Mr. Clay, and it was, no doubt, due to his influence that they now took the stand which they did. Within fifteen days Mr. Clay had accepted an invitation to be Secretary of State in Mr. Adams's cabinet. His nomination was sent to the Senate in the following March, and a mighty effort was made to defeat his confirmation. His enemies alleged that all they had said concerning him was now openly proven to be true, and that he had rendered himself utterly unworthy to fill so high a position. Once more he solicited the most painstaking inquiry into the facts, and averred himself ready to confront and disprove everything that looked like corruption upon his part. In spite of all the opposition that could be arrayed against him the Senate ratified his appointment by a vote of 27 to 15. Among those in the affirmative were Benton, Van Buren, and Harrison; and among those in the negative were Hayne, John Randolph—who had already sneered at “the coalition between Blifil and Black George, the Puritan and the blackleg”—John H. Eaton, and, of course, General Jackson.

Before leaving Washington for Tennessee, General Jackson paid his personal respects to President Adams, and seemed to have accepted the situation. On his way home, however, he was everywhere met with such assurances of regard as more and more to convince him that he was really the people's idol and had been cheated out of the presidency against their will. Only tell a man that he has been wronged, and repeat it often enough and with enough emphasis, and he will naturally acquire the rooted belief that it is true. In many public places on the route, as fully detailed in Parton's *Life of Andrew Jackson*, vol. iii, chapter x, the general distinctly charged that he could have reaped the benefit of Mr. Clay's influence if he had been willing, but that he had magnanimously refused to stoop to such a level. A due appreciation of his own merits was one of his strong points. It has never been alleged against him that he was afflicted with anything like unnecessary modesty. Parton says:

None of these remarkable utterances found their way into print at that time; but the poison worked in the mind of the unsuspecting voter. Kremer kept his promise to refer the matter to another

"tribunal." "Are the charges true?" he asked on the stump. "Can anyone doubt it who considers that Mr. Clay has performed the act which the letter charges him with intending to do, and now holds the office which was proclaimed as the consideration for the service rendered?" Imagine nonsense of this kind, repeated in a thousand newspapers, roared from a thousand stumps, insinuated in a thousand congressional appeals to rural buncombe, Mr. Adams silent meanwhile from a sense of official decorum; Mr. Clay silent for lack of a responsible accuser, for lack of a tangible accusation.

So things stood till 1827. In March of that year Mr. Carter Beverly, a prominent young Virginian, was a guest with a number of other gentlemen at the Hermitage. After leaving he wrote to a friend the appended letter, which speedily found its way into the columns of a paper in North Carolina:

I have just returned from General Jackson's. I found a crowd of company with him. Seven Virginians were of the number. He gave me a most friendly reception, and urged me to stay some days longer with him. He told me this morning, before all his company, in reply to a question that I put to him concerning the election of J. Q. Adams to the presidency, that Mr. Clay's friends made a proposition to his friends that, if they would promise for him [General Jackson] not to put Mr. Adams into the seat of Secretary of State, Mr. Clay and his friends would, in one hour, make him [Jackson] the President. He [General Jackson] most indignantly rejected the proposition, and declared that he would not compromise himself; and, unless most openly and fairly made the President by Congress, he would never receive it. He declared that he said to them he would see the whole earth sink under them before he would bargain or intrigue for it.

This involved and awkward document put a new face on the situation. It was widely published, and in some quarters its statements were called in question. Mr. Carter accordingly appealed to General Jackson to state the facts. The general replied at length, and virtually made himself sponsor, not only for all of Kremer's allegations, but also for much more. We quote from his letter:

Early in January, 1825, a member of Congress, of high respectability, visited me one morning, and observed that he had a communication he was desirous to make to me; that he was informed there was a great intrigue going on, and that it was right I should be informed of it; that he came as a friend, and, let me receive the communication as I might, the friendly motives through which it was made he hoped would prevent any change of friendship or feeling in regard to him. To which I replied, from his high standing as a gentleman and member of Congress and from his

uniform friendly and gentlemanly conduct toward myself I could not suppose he would make any communication to me which he supposed was improper. The gentleman proceeded. He said he had been informed by the friends of Mr. Clay that the friends of Mr. Adams had made overtures to them, saying, if Mr. Clay and his friends would unite in aid of Mr. Adams's election, Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State; that the friends of Mr. Adams were urging, as a reason to induce the friends of Mr. Clay to accede to their proposition, that if I were elected President Mr. Adams would be continued Secretary of State (*innuendo*, there would be no room for Kentucky); that the friends of Mr. Clay stated that the West did not wish to separate from the West, and if I would say, or permit any of my confidential friends to say, that in case I were elected President Mr. Adams should not be continued Secretary of State, by a complete union of Mr. Clay and his friends they would put an end to the presidential contest in one hour. And he was of the opinion that it was right to fight such intrigues with their own weapons. To which in substance I replied that, in politics as in everything else, my guide was principle; and contrary to the expressed and unbiased will of the people I never would step into the presidential chair; and requested him to say to Mr. Clay and his friends (for I did suppose that he had come from Mr. Clay, although he used the term of "Mr. Clay's friends") that, before I would reach the presidential chair by such means of bargain and corruption, I would see the earth open and swallow both Mr. Clay and his friends, and myself with them. . . . The second day after this communication and reply it was announced in the newspapers that Mr. Clay had come out openly and avowedly in favor of Mr. Adams. It may be proper to observe that on the supposition that Mr. Clay was not privy to the proposition stated I may have done injustice to him. If so the gentleman informing me can explain.

As soon as Mr. Clay had seen a copy of this letter he published "a direct, unqualified, and indignant denial." I have room for only a brief quotation. Said he, in conclusion:

Such being the accusation, and the prosecutor, and the issue between us, I have a right now to expect that he will substantiate his charges by the exhibition of satisfactory evidence. In that event there is no punishment that would exceed the measure of my offense. In the opposite event, what ought to be the judgment of the American public is cheerfully submitted to their wisdom and justice.

Again General Jackson took up his pen and addressed himself to the public, but the only thing he said germane to the question at issue was that James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, was the congressman who had approached him to see whether he

was minded to make terms with Mr. Clay. Mr. Buchanan, thus put upon the stand, did not prove to be a good witness for the fiery Tennessean. In a communication to the *Lancaster Journal* he admitted that on December 30, 1824, he had had a confidential interview with General Jackson in regard to the rumor which was afloat to the effect that, in case of his election, Mr. Adams was to be his Secretary of State, and had suggested to him the imprudence of allowing such a rumor to become current. He also confessed that he had mentioned Mr. Clay as a man whose name might well be considered in connection with the chief cabinet position, but concluded by saying:

I called upon General Jackson upon the occasion which I have mentioned solely as his friend, upon my individual responsibility, and not as the agent of Mr. Clay or any other person.

In spite of the definite, explicit, and unmodified exculpation of Mr. Clay and his friends contained in these words, General Jackson and many of his partisans insisted that Mr. Buchanan had sustained their charge of an attempted bargain. Was there ever blindness so willful? Daniel Webster wrote:

I do not think that General Jackson can ever recover from the blow which he has received. Many persons think Buchanan's letter candid. I deem it otherwise. It seems to me he labored very hard to protect the general, as far as he could, without injury to himself.

General Jackson was not a man to change his mind. The staunchest of friends, he was also the bitterest of foes. He had a fixed mental habit of attributing to his opponents every bad motive that could affect human action. He therefore lived and died in the belief, not only that Henry Clay was guilty of this particular piece of villainy, but also that, if he was not actually guilty of everything else that was base, the reason was to be found, not in lack of intent, but in lack of opportunity.

To come back to the main question, the only thing that can in the least give color to Kremer's charges is the fact that Mr. Clay did help to make Mr. Adams President and that Mr. Adams did appoint Mr. Clay to the secretaryship of State. But it is far from being an inconceivable thing that they both supposed they were doing what, under all the circumstances, was right and proper to be done. Of proof of bargain and intrigue, or of

any previous understanding, there was not a shred. Against such a supposition many considerations are to be urged :

1. The character of Mr. Clay. That he had his faults is not to be denied. They were such faults as must forever subtract from his reputation as a man. But they lay wholly, or almost wholly, in the sphere and region of his private life. From his young manhood up to his decrepit old age he was a self-respecting, high-minded, and patriotic citizen. That he loved his country sincerely is as clear as sunshine. If there were time and opportunity I could cite numbers of instances in which he took positions in politics that militated directly against his own preferment. Would such a man, conscious of his own great powers, and with a magnificent future still before him, barter off his manhood for a place in the cabinet of Mr. Adams? Let any sane person answer the question !

2. The character of Mr. Adams. He was as cold as a block of ice, but also as pure. Let it be granted that he was ambitious and selfish. At the same time his whole career testifies that he was one of the cleanest public men that ever trod the stage of civil affairs. Would such a man, just for once, forget his principles and descend to unutterable depths of personal degradation? The thing is impossible. Long after the events had ceased to have any practical significance Mr. Adams said :

Prejudice and passion have charged Mr. Clay with obtaining office by bargain and corruption. Before you, my fellow-citizen, in the presence of our country and Heaven, I pronounce that charge totally unfounded. This tribute of justice is due from me to him, and I seize with pleasure the opportunity afforded me of discharging the obligation. As to my motives for tendering to him the department of State when I did, let that man who questions them come forward; let him look around among statesmen and legislators of this nation and of that day; let him then select and name the man whom, by his preeminent talents, by his splendid services, by his ardent patriotism, by his all-embracing public spirit, by his fervid eloquence in behalf of the rights and liberties of mankind, and by his long experience in the affairs of the Union, foreign and domestic, a President of the United States, intent only upon the welfare and honor of his country, ought to have preferred to Henry Clay. Let him name the man, and then judge you, my fellow-citizens, of my motives.


3. The known fact, already alluded to, that Mr. Clay's determination as to what course he should pursue as between

Crawford, Jackson, and Adams was already made up and expressed before he left Kentucky, and before there had been any, even the least, opportunity for trading, bargaining, or conference between his friends and those of Mr. Adams.

4. It is said that he could have effectually disproved all of Kremer's charges by declining to accept the secretaryship. To me, at least, it does not look that way. Those charges were designed, in the first instance, either to frighten him into voting for Andrew Jackson or else to break the force of his influence as the friend of Mr. Adams. If after he had voted for Adams he had refused to take a place in the cabinet the hue and cry would have been raised that he had been caught in the midst of a dishonorable transaction and hindered by exposure from carrying it through to the end. Conscious as he was of his innocence, and not believing that his fellow-countrymen would ever reckon him a dishonest place-seeker, conscious of his ability for great employments, and properly ambitious for just distinction, he could see no reason why he should cower in the presence of his malignant enemies and thrust away from himself a preferment that had come without any taint of disgrace or dishonor upon it. And posterity has acquitted him. Even in his own lifetime, says Carl Schurz,

He received letters from such men as Chief Justice Marshall, John Tyler, Justice Story, Daniel Webster, Lewis Cass, and others, congratulating him upon the completeness of his . . . triumph. But he lived to appreciate the wonderful vitality of a well-managed political lie. Nobody believes that lie now. But it defeated his dearest ambitions, and darkened the rest of his public life.

On one point Mr. Schurz is slightly in error. There are still some people who accept the tale just as George Kremer, poor creature of Peggy O'Neal's husband, in his leopard-skin overcoat, first told it. There are also some people who disbelieve in the Newtonian theory of the attraction of gravitation; and there are others, for example, the Rev. John Jasper, who are quite sure that the sun revolves about the earth. But such people are not to be counted.



EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

♦♦♦

OPINION.

THE subject of transfers is always under discussion, and is frequently brought to the front in Conference deliberation and action by the arrival or proposed introduction of new men from other Conferences, especially when they are to fill particularly desirable or prominent places. The literature of the question, as it may be found spread upon the pages of Conference Minutes and in occasional articles in the columns of Methodist periodicals, would, if collected, be voluminous. It would be found, we apprehend, to illustrate to a considerable extent the possible vigor of the English language as used by men in talking of matters in which they are really interested. It would display some variety, now exhibiting much intensity of feeling, and now only a mild request for equity and an observance of the law of equivalents by balancing each transfer so far as possible with an exchange. The records, if examined, would reveal no little difference in the way in which different Conferences regard the matter of transfers, indicating that in some Conferences the doors are kept pretty wide open both for ingress and egress, with a constant current in both directions, transfers being accepted as a matter of course, as a part of the order of nature under our itinerant system, vital to connectional unity, and necessary to the most efficient working of our machinery, which aims to arrange for the greatest good of the greatest number; while, in marked contrast, in other Conferences the fences of exclusion are built strong and high, jealously guarded, and annually repaired, or, adopting a military figure, the active forces of the Conference appear as if organized into a hollow square, presenting fixed bayonets to all points of the compass, regarding every transgression of their boundaries as an assault upon individual and collective rights. The journals would show that a Conference has sometimes modified and moderated its sentiments even to the extent of saying that transfers are too few rather than too many, and that what is needed is to make them more general. A Conference has even been observed to pass strong resolutions against transfers, and then, with characteristic magnanimity and generous recognition of merit, to use the first good chance it found to elect at the head of its General Conference delegation the transferred man against whose introduction the resolutions had been chiefly directed.

Transfer literature would also show some historic modifications of sentiment in individual ministers, explicable, apparently, by change of circumstances. A good man has been known to write a series of intense articles for the public press, ably arguing in opposition to transfers and setting forth their iniquitous nature, and, shortly after, to be guilty of consenting to accept an attractive invitation which transferred him to a distant Con-

ference. It is matter of history that a certain stalwart, powerful, greatly revered, and influential minister of a former generation, a true captain of the Lord's hosts, directed a portion of his keen ability for years to denouncing colleges and theological schools, and especially to ridiculing with sharp satire the practice of making men doctors of divinity, until at last the information came to him across the sunshine of a summer day that a venerable institution in a neighboring State had marked his merits and recognized them by conferring on him the degree of D.D. Strange to tell, the tidings did not irritate him; but from that day he maintained the dignified silence of a pacified soul. It is characteristic of a wise man to change his mind when there are reasons for it. That some men spend all their lives in one Conference does not, however, prove that they have not had opportunities and urgent solicitations to change; for there are those so averse to strangeness and so attached to familiar surroundings as to resist even the most strenuous efforts and most alluring inducements to take them out of their Conferences, and among these are some of the most widely invited men in all Methodism. The result of transfers is not always good; they carry a percentage of mistakes, as do also the ordinary Conference appointments, as well as all human attempts at adjustment. Churches sometimes invite, upon incorrect and insufficient information, men whose faults are concealed and whose excellencies are magnified by distance, failing to perceive that men who could render better service are close at hand. Yet the transfer system is absolutely essential to the connectional life of Methodism, and none the less to important local interests in all parts of the Church. Moreover, in many instances it has been the making of a man when he has been transferred from the region in which his ministry began, and in which, perhaps, he was born and grew up, to a Conference where he was not known. Men have found a tonic in the change of climate and a stimulus in new environment which let loose life and power for larger achievements and a nobler service, so that the result of transfer was for them like "another morning risen on mid-noon." In most of our Conferences are men of various ages, going the rounds of limited opportunity and plodding monotonously over familiar ground, who could do nothing better for themselves and the Church than to discover some new world, and seek fresh fortunes and wider usefulness amid unaccustomed scenes. The Wilmington Conference at its last session seems to have appropriated to itself the distinction of contributing to the literature of the transfer question resolutions which, so far as our knowledge goes, are unique, and serve to diversify previous monotony. The report, written by the Rev. E. L. Hubbard, Ph.D., pastor of Union Church, Wilmington, presented by the committee, and adopted by the Conference, is as follows:

Whereas, The Methodist Episcopal Church is not a union of Conferences bound together by certain general interests, each under its own local legislation, but is a unit from sea to sea and from the Gulf to Canada; and,

Whereas, The division of the Church into Conferences is for convenience and effectiveness of administration, no peculiar rights or privileges inhering in any localities bounded by Conference lines; and,

Whereas, Certain more favorably located Conferences strenuously oppose the free and easy working of the transfer system, thus interfering with the appointing power and the general superintendency of the Church; and,

Whereas, The churches built expressly to be accommodated by the transfer system have thus far been true to the doctrine and polity of the Church and have greatly aided the local and general benevolences; nevertheless, as we fear the tendency to make real the rumor of a star Conference with star churches is drifting toward an independent Methodism, thus destroying that unique fraternity, the Methodist itinerancy, to which the present generation owes so much; and,

Whereas, Our fathers have taught us to regard our annual appointments as providential assignments to most blessed opportunities of preaching the whole Gospel, we deprecate this tendency that threatens to destroy faith in the integrity of the administration; and,

Whereas, Some of the members of this Conference feel that it is easier for one than another to secure a transfer, though equally deserving and anxious; therefore, be it

Resolved, 1. That every Methodist Episcopal preacher is eligible to any pastorate in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

2. That, while we recognize the convenience of boundaries, we deny the right of barriers between Conferences.

3. That the principle of appointment by the system of transfer is a vital part of the itinerant machinery, to be preserved as carefully as appointment by transfer from one Conference district to another.

4. That we note with great interest the growing custom of erecting churches within the bounds of Conferences to be supplied exclusively by transfers from other Conferences, and fondly anticipate the multiplication of these churches until the supply shall equal the demand. If we must have star churches let no church star be constellated.

5. The peach orchards from this classic peninsula teach us that trees from other States often bear better fruit when transplanted to this soil than do the trees of our own nurseries. In harmony with this lesson from nature we extend the hand of fellowship to all whom the bishops transfer to us, and will try to hinder none who can be transferred from us.

THE one hundred and fifth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which met in Washington in May, was a sturdy, resolute, peremptory, and thoroughgoing body, reminding one of the saying, "It is the glory of Puritanism that it found its highest work in the strengthening of the will." A formidable amount of typical Puritanic will was on exhibition for ten days in Washington. A solid and all-powerful majority marched in unwavering column from stage to stage, and executed its will with that unflinching fidelity which conscientious servants of God display under an urgent sense of solemn duty. The Assembly pulled the reins on the liberal leaders with tremendous force. Some little affirming was done, but for the most part the proceedings were full of the spirit which says "No," and negatived a good many things with a vigorous, not to say vociferous, veto.

Presbyterianism said, through its General Assembly: No Professor Briggs nor Preserved Smith; no Union Seminary nor Lane Seminary; no errors in the original manuscripts of the Holy Scripture, which were lost so long ago that we have no acquaintance with or direct knowledge of them; no errors in the Bible as we now have it—at least, none worth speaking of—none that affect its infallibility; no revision of the Westminster Confession, although parts of it are publicly and energetically

repudiated in many of the pulpits of the denomination and suppressed in nearly all; no shorter creed for any purpose or use, although not one convert in a thousand can assent to the creed as it stands without mental reservations; no modification anywhere of the authoritative formulas of Calvinism, although no man to-day dares to preach the particulars thereof, because no congregation would endure them; no sufficiency of reason or of the Church as a guide in the matter of salvation or as a channel through which God reveals himself; no knowledge of Jesus Christ outside of the Holy Scriptures; no rationalistic teachings in pulpit or theological school; no permission to scholars to vary from the opinions of the majority on matters which said majority considers vital or important; no progress in holiness after death; no delay over legal technicalities; no weight to the decision of the New York Presbytery; no recognition of the New York Synod as a court of intermediate jurisdiction.

The victorious and the defeated parties both claim to be zealous champions of the Bible as the true word of God, as the one supreme divine revelation, as the only authoritative and infallible rule of faith and practice. Both claim to stand for inerrancy, but each for such inerrancy as is required by and harmonious with its own views, and neither, if we correctly understand their utterances, for entire and absolute inerrancy of the Bible as we now have it. The advanced scholars contend that the Scriptures are inerrant as to all the essential things which revelation was given to teach and which men could not know without a revelation, but that there are some errors touching matters not pertaining to salvation. The conservatives affirm that the Bible, not only in its original form as given by God in the beginning, but also in its present form as the centuries have handed it down to us, has been guarded of God, and is free from all error—or rather is nearly so, and would be completely so but for a few unimportant mistakes, which, they say, crept in by the ignorance or carelessness of transcribers, translators, revisers, or typographers and which the Author of revelation has not thought it necessary to prevent.

How long the present majority can retain control of the denomination is uncertain. No contest was really decided by it. The struggle, which seemed to reach a notable crisis there, has not yet culminated. The greatest questions involved still remain in the arena of debate. The Westminster Confession will be modified in spite of the majority vote of a hundred General Assemblies. Methodism was God's instrument for deciding that, and it was settled a hundred years ago. At least so it seems to the writer, a by no means inerrant but very fallible mortal, who is so conscious of his fallibility, both in knowledge and in judgment, that nothing could induce him to persecute another mortal who might see fit to differ with him in opinion.

SUMMER philanthropy has an ever-increasing field for its operation. It is a mistake, born of ignorance or indifference to the facts, to assume that only in the colder seasons of the year is there distress among the worthy poor and an anxious waiting for alleviation by Christian char-

ity. The cessation of the frosts does not always bring returning health. The melting of the winter snows and the reappearance of nature's abundant blossoms are no pledge of a full larder. Probably no less than winter rigor is summer heat a period of suffering in the homes of the poor. The very increase in temperature brings its peculiar diseases—often sudden, intense, and quick in their fatality—against which poverty has no protection. And even if there be escape from such virulent disease there is among the destitute a need of fresh and nutritious food, of cooling drinks, of refreshing shade, for which the cry ever comes to the Christian ear from out the bitter depths of penury. So that true benevolence, mindful neither of times nor of seasons, ever moves on its holy mission through the scenes of squalor and destitution.

But with the enlargement of the opportunity for summer philanthropy, resulting from the ever-multiplying population of our American cities, there seems also an ever-increasing application of practical charity among the deserving poor. Never in the onward movement of the Christian system has such wise and widespread attention been given to the summer wants of the "submerged tenth" as at the present time. Even the bare enumeration of these kindly charities, covering many fields of successful operation, would transcend our present limits. Time would fail to mention the beneficent work of flower missions, of floating hospitals, of ice distribution among the poorer districts, of free medical attendance among our tenement populations, and of fresh-air excursions which bring health and gladness to thousands of suffering children. Each recurring summer seems, in fact, to show greater activity on the part of these benevolences and, through the financial contributions of many friends, an increase in the number of beneficiaries blessed. Yet it would be a matter for sadness rather than congratulation were it known that the limit of such philanthropic activity had been reached. The little which has been done to alleviate the summer wretchedness of the poor seems beggarly in comparison with what has perforce been left undone. Even the much that Christian interest and sense of conviction would do, were its ability commensurate with its desires, hardly includes the whole field of need. The example which has sometimes been set by the great newspapers of the day, or by other corporations purely secular, should have a general imitation on the part of commercial and Christian organizations. In the not distant future, if the relations between employer and employed continue to receive their definition and emphasis, our great wholesale and retail establishments will find it necessary to pay greater attention to the summer recreation of their subordinates. The duty of our Sunday schools, also, is only measured by their treasury. The writer knows the case of a twelve-year-old scholar in one of our metropolitan Sabbath schools, a winsome and beautiful child, who is city-born and has never looked upon the country in her life. She is one of thousands. In the better times to come our churches, moreover, must help give the adult poor the sight of the Lord's mountains and sea, and in so doing will give them the Gospel. manifold is the opportunity for true charity in its unobtrusive ministrations.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

CHURCH UNION; THE CHICAGO-LAMBETH INITIATIVE; ONE
WORD MORE.

If any one supposes that Christian unity is a threadbare theme he is in error; it remains an intense and living question for this decade and the next. How great a service may have been rendered to the power of Protestant Christendom and the weal of the world by the overtures toward reunion promulgated from Chicago and Lambeth it is yet too early to estimate. Those proposals summoned all communions to a searching examination of the momentous subject of Christian unity. It is undeniable that they have already succeeded in concentrating attention upon the topic and have brought about the world-wide discussion they invited. The size and shape of ultimate results cannot be foreseen. A quarter century is but a brief time for considering so extensive and intricate a matter; but the general subject is launched upon the moving current of the age and cannot be recalled. The discussion, which is only well begun, will go on until something satisfactory is accomplished.

The first set debate in this country over the reunion overtures herein referred to took place in the pages of the *Church Review*, between twelve writers from the Episcopal Church, four of whom were bishops, and twenty from other denominations. The present editor of the *Methodist Review*, as one of the twenty, offered the following response, which, as it has not appeared on any Methodist page, he ventures to reproduce here, desiring to follow it with some further reflections which, in the light of later events and utterances, may seem neither irrelevant nor untimely:

"This article is invited by a request which presents as materials for consideration the overtures toward reunion put forth by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church in 1886, the Lambeth Conference indorsement of the same in 1888, and the conclusions of the London Conference of leading Anglicans and Nonconformists held in December, 1889. It is proper that our response to this courteous invitation should be with equal courtesy of spirit as well as with such perfect candor as is necessary to personal honesty and to the value of any discussion. Nothing but good, and perhaps greater good than any of us foresee, can come of frank and fraternal debate. To save ourselves at the outset from the misfortune of being at any point misunderstood, we premise our conviction that fervent love, utter respect, and general cooperation between all Christian bodies, resulting in all possible effective unity, are parts of 'a consummation devoutly to be wished;' and there is no prayer in which we join more earnestly than that of Christ for oneness among his disciples, in which petition we imagine that we hear the voice of Protestant Christendom uniting. We apprehend that the only difference of opinion will be over the kind and form of unity considered possible.

"The first three quarters of the basis proposed for union by the House of Bishops and the Lambeth Conference is intelligibly clear and, we think, not in the nature of things impossible to agree upon. Over the Holy Scriptures as the first foundation stone there can be no dispute. Agreement upon the two creeds, which are virtually one, as a sufficient statement of Christian faith seems perhaps a not altogether unlikely or remote possibility; for undeniably the trend of the time is toward an abbreviation of creeds, contracting the required confessions of belief into narrower compass. Our personal sympathies and judgment move in that direction; and, if we mistake not, the persuasion grows throughout Protestant Christendom that wisdom lies that way. A firm adherence to the few items absolutely necessary to constitute Christian faith, with range and verge for free opinion beyond, has obvious and great advantages. One advantage is that this course returns us toward the simplicity of the primitive Church, freeing us possibly from some things which may be of the nature of incrustation rather than growth, and tending to save us from the error of teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Another gain in such abbreviation of creed requirements is that it renders feasible a more extensive unity, as fewer points of harmony are held requisite for union. Do not interest and justice both urge to this? Would not this larger inclusiveness put the Church in possession of its own by claiming and appropriating all those who vitally belong to it, while it would admit to church privileges everyone who is essentially Christian and, therefore, fairly entitled to recognition and membership? There can be no danger in this. A strengthening of the stakes of the Christian tent would make safe a lengthening of its cords to an enlarged comprehensiveness. Put loud and unanimous accent on the fundamentals. Let the solid emphasis of all Protestant Churches be massed on the few central essentials of faith, closely compacted in statement, instead of being distributed and dispersed over voluminous amplifications and peripheric variations, and there will be no peril in embracing all who loyally assent to those indisputable essentials.

"Another effect of a restriction of Christian creeds to the comprehensive fundamentals is an allowance of greater liberty in nonessentials and in items of secondary importance, a larger range to individual thought and taste in what may be derived through experience or reasoned and constructed on the divinely outlined foundations. We take it to be the general opinion of our day that such an allowance of freedom is in harmony with true progress. A formal union which does not permit liberty to individuality is mechanical, superficial, insincere, oppressive, and temporary. While we witness many efforts toward realizing brotherhood and organizing unity of various kinds, the most imperious voice that shakes the air of to-day is the one which demands recognition and protection for the rights of the individual, both in matters of thought and in matters of conduct. Protestantism and democratic institutions are responsible for that. It is essential to the soundness and stability of any sort of union that only so much concession toward concert of opinion and

action be asked of each member as may be absolutely indispensable to the secure existence of that union.

"The Lambeth report's third condition of union, relating to the sacraments, may be passed with approval and without debate. It is at the fourth and last point of the proposed basis that we are brought to a halt by what seems a lack of explicitness. The documents themselves give us no light as to what is intended by the 'historic episcopate' in the overtures of the Episcopal bishops or their Lambeth indorsement. Is it our obtuseness, or is it something else, that causes perplexity or hesitation in us of 'other communions' over many Episcopalian and Anglican deliverances on the subject of church union? When the American bishops say, in a communication to the House of Deputies, 'We believe that all who have been *duly* baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost are members of the Holy Catholic Church,' we receive no clear message, because we are in doubt what is the precise thought behind that one word '*duly*.' In like manner, when the same message says, 'In all things of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this Church is ready in the spirit of love and humility to forego all preferences of her own' for the sake of unity with others, while our hearts burn within us responsively to the sweet, gentle, winsome tone of the utterance, we are yet not informed by the message what things the House of Bishops regards as of 'human ordering or human choice;' and just there lies a possibility of the reopening of an ancient debate, from differences of opinion between the bishops and the unprelatical denominations. We count it also a defect in many of the appeals for union that they fail to include a definition of the nature and degree of the desired unity. Collateral evidence, however, indicates that generally, if not always, it is organic union that is contemplated in such overtures. The *Church Review*, in its issue of January, 1890, spoke of the resolutions adopted by the Conference of leading Anglicans and Nonconformists in London, the preceding December, as 'the only practical result yet reached in the matter of organic unity.'

"The first and greatest obstacle in the way of such union is the diversity of opinion as to its possibility or desirability. Without any disposition to imply that it is impossible for the Anglican Church in Britain and the United States to be God's chosen instrument to lead on a world-wide reform, we may yet remark that it seems somewhat strange that, if the organic union of Christendom is a necessity, such intelligent and enterprising bodies as the great Presbyterian Church, the Congregational Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church should not perceive its desirability, and, with their characteristic zeal, practical habits of mind, and desire for the highest systematic efficiency, move for it. Is there any sign that these influential Churches regard organic union as a clear *desideratum*? No fact is better known than that the non-Anglican communions have not been in the habit of considering denominationalism in general an unmitigated evil; while of course each denomination thinks its own sepa-

rate existence justifiable and necessary. It is not certain that any one of these religious bodies, if it had the power to destroy denominationalism by absorbing all other Churches and Christians into its own fold, would do so, the reason for this being a persuasion that denominationalism in itself has a mission, the fulfillment of which has been and will be beneficent and variously advantageous. It is quite impossible for us to believe that the majority of Protestant Christians will ever be prepared to agree with the Rev. William Granger, a zealous and honorable advocate of church union, that the father of lies is the author of denominationalism, any more than they will concede the assertion of the Romish Church that Protestantism is a work of the devil.

"The American Episcopal bishops say, 'This Church does not seek to absorb other communions,' but if 'any Christian bodies' seek 'the restoration of the organic unity of the Church' the Church is ready 'to enter into brotherly conference' with such bodies. If any prophet sees in the ecclesiastical sky a sign as big as a man's hand that any of those 'bodies' are seeking or likely to seek organic union with the Church which now issues overtures, we shall be glad to have the token pointed out. In 1872 Dr. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, characterized it as visionary to 'look forward to a time when all the various denominations throughout Britain are to come and desire admission into the Church of England.' The sagacity of this opinion is plain to minds of only ordinary discernment from less lofty points of observation than the archbishopric of Canterbury.

"The *Church Review* in its issue of January, 1890, remarking on the fact that no Methodists joined in the Conference of leading Anglicans and Nonconformists in London the previous month, said: 'The Methodists are exactly those upon whom our claim is the strongest and who had least ground for quitting our fellowship.' In a sermon in Christ Church, Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, a New York city rector said in presence of the Bishop of Long Island, 'If we had treated the Methodists wisely and fairly they would not have gone out from us.'

"If the Methodists are especially in mind in the appeals for church union we can only say that the time of their probable return in a body to the Anglican communion seems to us very remote; indeed, all reasonable expectation of such a return is as dead as the cause of the Stuarts, with whose restoration under Charles II, in 1660, the less liberal and more exclusive views toward non-Episcopalian bodies were fastened on the Anglican Church. The House of Hanover is as likely to abdicate in favor of the descendants of the Stuarts as the Methodist Church is to abjure its right of existence in deference to Anglican views. And surely the noble and intelligent men who are urging the overtures herein considered are too wise to suppose that, in any approach toward union, any one of the non-Episcopalian bodies will be influenced in the slightest degree by a desire to recover connection, alleged to be lost, with an 'historic episcopate.' The day never can come which will find these large and powerful denominations dissatisfied with the validity and authority of their minis-

try or the genuineness of their standing as proper and living parts of the body of Christ. In these matters they will abide solidly on the foundations they have chosen. They believe, with some of the greatest leaders the Episcopal Church has ever had, that 'apostolic succession,' so-called, is a myth, entirely unprovable, and spiritually valueless even if it were proven. Nor have pretensions to superiority based on this notion always been put forth by the Anglican Church. If we mistake not there were a hundred years during which, in the language of an eminent clergyman of that communion, 'No one in the Church of England thought of calling in question the validity of the orders and sacraments of the Reformed Churches,' which were presbyterial in ordination and government, and from which ministers and members were received to immediate and equal standing in the Church of England.

"We hold that there may be a vital and effective unity of Protestantism without organic consolidation, and that in our time every sunrise finds that spiritual oneness more complete. It is absurd in these days to imply that denominationalism necessarily means 'bitterness and unhallowed strife.' The only strife it legitimately stimulates is an emulous rivalry in usefulness. The lamentable old dim days of mutual misconception, which were like that battle on dark Dundagil by the Cornish Sea, where

Friend and foe were mingled in the midst,
And friend slew friend, not knowing whom he slew,

are long gone by, and more and more on all the circuit of great Zion's walls the watchmen see eye to eye and concentrate hostilities upon the foe.

"Whether an organic union of all, or of the principal, Protestant communions is desirable or even possible, is matter for gradual elucidation by freer and frank discussions like the present, in the spirit of love and meekness, with a disposition to make all possible concessions 'for euphony's sake,' as the college phrase puts it. While to us neither the possibility nor the desirability is clear, we offer to all sincere and earnest reasoners a hospitable mind open to light and conviction.

"One thing, it seems to us, must occur to every reflective mind. In all attempts at reform a logical order and natural sequence of consistent action should be preserved, and, whether it be organic union or only a perfect fraternity and cooperation that is aimed at, all overtures are likely to be futile if unaccompanied by a full recognition, in utterance and bearing and action, of ecclesiastical equality, a practical recognition by an even interchange of pulpits, ministers, and members. Negotiations for union ought to be conducted on a level, and not on an incline. If the latter is the case the consulting group has difficulty in keeping its footing on the slope long enough to hold a conference, and the members of it tend to slide away from one another. Until every barrier to actual fraternity is thrown flat by the hands which now hold such barriers up organic unity is certainly a Utopian dream. In a message to the House of Deputies the Protestant Episcopal House of Bishops in 1886 avowed the 'solemn purpose' to seek some practical plan for 'terminating the unhappy divisions' which separate their 'fellow Christians in this land;' but in the

same message the bishops declined to approve a resolution adopted by the House of Deputies sending mere cordial greetings to their 'Congregational brethren' assembled at the same time in the same city. We must be pardoned if, like Mr. Lincoln, we are 'reminded of a story.' In Warren County, New Jersey, is a village named Harmony. At Martin's Creek, one day, a traveler asked a man whom he met on the road, 'How far is it to Harmony if I go straight ahead?' 'Well,' replied the man, 'if you go straight ahead in the direction you are going it is about twenty-five thousand miles, but if you will turn right around it is three miles.' We do not trifle. Our words are earnest, prayerful, and loving. Shameful would it be to write or speak otherwise on the sacred and momentous subject of Christian unity. If there be any question which men should consider upon their knees this is one of them. If there be one desire which we ought to foster with hopeful and yearning hearts, making it dictate our prayers and our actions, it is that the great Head of the Church universal will lead on his leagued hosts ordered in whatever unity shall contribute most to widest and swiftest victory. We are bound to hold our doubts in check with the constant remembrance of the lesson history teaches, that it is possible for us to be living, without knowing it, on the eve of great events; and the perfect unification in some form or other of all Christian forces may be nearer now than we think."

The debate of which the above was a part was declared by the *Church Review* to be the most notable religious discussion since the Reformation and certain to prove the most fruitful. One of the writers who replied for the Episcopal Church found fault with us for quoting from Rev. R. P. Blakeney, D.D., LL.D., of Christ Church, Cloughton, England, the statement that during a certain hundred years "no one in the Church of England thought of calling in question the validity of the orders and sacraments of the Reformed Churches," which were presbyterial in ordinations and government, and from which ministers and members were received into immediate and equal standing in the Church of England. If the words we quoted are "historically false," as asserted in the *Church Review*, the mistake belongs to the Anglican author of them, and not to us. Frankly, the statement seems to us extreme, for probably there were some strict sacerdotalists who magnified Episcopal ordination; but it is historically plain that they were uninfluential in controlling official action. In the first chapter of Macaulay's *History of England* is this passage: "An instrument is still extant by which the Primate of all England, in the year 1582, authorized a Scotch minister, ordained according to the laudable forms of the Scotch Church by the Synod of East Lothian, to preach and administer the sacraments in any part of the province of Canterbury. In the year 1603 the convocation solemnly recognized the Church of Scotland, a Church in which episcopal control and episcopal ordination were then unknown, as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. It was even held that Presbyterian ministers were entitled to place and voice in ecumenical councils. . . . Nay, many English benefices were held by divines

who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form used on the Continent, nor was reordination by a bishop in such cases then thought necessary or even lawful."

So much by way of competently authoritative statement concerning Christian unity in Great Britain in the sixteenth century. To this we may add that it is declared, as appears in Mr. Faulkner's article in our present issue by authority higher than our critic, that in the post-Reformation period ministers not episcopally ordained were appointed to office in the Church, which action was defended even by High Churchmen in England, Ireland, and Scotland; and that the Church of England "hath never publicly condemned and pronounced the ordination of the other Reformed Churches to be void." In agreement with this is the statement of the Rev. Charles James Wood, special lecturer in 1892 to the Episcopal Theological School, at Cambridge, Mass., that apostolic succession cannot be proven; that there is no assertion of a tactual succession in the Articles of Religion; that it was not held by the English reformers, nor insisted on by Cosin, Jewel, Andrewes, Hall, or Whitgift; and that to insist that it is essential to the being of the Church would be to out-Herod Herod, since even the Church of Rome has not always insisted on reordination. "If then," argues the lecturer, "the tremendous assumption of such a ministerial succession, as shall serve for an unbroken conduit for a substantial force called grace, gives no signs of itself, . . . we may well ask ourselves if it be necessary to hold tactual succession and substantial grace; and if we do what is the practical outcome?"

As to the attitude of the Episcopal Church in relation to this subject in early American history it is proper to reproduce the following paragraph from an article by Dean Stanley, which appeared in *Littell's Living Age*, in July, 1889: "In the State archives at Hartford there is still to be seen a petition from the Episcopal clergy of Connecticut urging the governor of the State to use his influence in inducing the Congregationalist clergy to allow them access to the eucharist. There is something highly instructive in a record which represents the clergy of the Church of Archbishop Laud and Bishop Ken acknowledging the spiritual validity and value of sacraments administered by Congregationalists and half imploring the civil power to force this rival Church to allow them to participate in its communion."

It must be confessed that the discussion by thirty-two participants in the *Church Review*, to a part of which we have just replied, was ominously discouraging; at its close the prospects of reunion, so far as appeared therein, did not seem to have been helped in the least by the Lambeth proposals. The "historic episcopate," which had been mentioned simply as a fact in the original overtures, without definition of its nature, significance, or authority, was sharply defined by the *Church Review* writers with unflinching and repellent severity, and the only thing made clear was a great gulf fixed between the Anglicans and all non-Anglican bodies. The writers selected to represent the Episcopal side were, for the most part, rigid High Churchmen, and the unanimity of their prelat-

ical views was appalling to all friends of union. The *Church Review*, in summing up the debate, remarked with evident satisfaction that the carefully chosen Episcopalian writers "agreed in every particular on all the great questions at issue;" that the discussion had made it "impossible for any bishop, priest, or layman of the Anglican communion to say that the term 'historic episcopate' does not mean what is generally known, inside the Church and out of it, as apostolic succession;" that "the Church of England has never recognized any other than Episcopal ordination;" and that when Episcopal rectors invite into their pulpits ministers of other Churches they are guilty of a violation of the laws of the Church and a breach of their ordination vows, the offense being the same whenever they assist in services in non-Episcopal Churches.

The stiff, unbending attitude of those twelve apostles of "apostolic succession" in the *Church Review*, and their precipitously lofty claims—including the *jure divino* theory of the episcopate, the triple-ordered ministry, and the tactual transmission of ministerial grace, authority, and power—caused us to say within ourselves that, if the cause of reunion was to be so quickly and fatally wounded in the house of its professed friends, we wondered why it ever was begun. To broach overtures of union and then to take the most extremely obstructive position, as if they held a palm branch in the left hand and a drawn sword in the right, seemed a clear sign that their idea of union was that we should make an utter and uncompensated surrender by abandoning our position and coming to theirs. When we closed the volume which contained these priestly and episcopal utterances nothing seemed left us but to adopt, concerning the Church of England, the language in which the committee of seventeen bishops, in their report to the Lambeth Conference, expressed themselves touching the advisability of sending overtures to the papal Church. They declared it useless to consider the possibility of union therewith, because "painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority against which we have felt for three centuries bound to protest." The papal claims to absolute authority are not more peremptory than those of the High Church Anglicans: and submission to such pretensions, whether issuing from the banks of Tiber or Thames, is no easier for us than for the Lambeth churchmen. As to the relations of the Episcopal body to Rome, many Romanists do not hesitate to describe the Anglican Church as the connecting link between the Papal and Protestant Churches, pointing out that, while its Low Church wing is positively Protestant, its extreme ritualistic, sacramentarian, sacerdotal wing is scarcely distinguishable from Romanism; and some affirm that in the meditative bosom of Rome, along with age-long purposes and astute policies, there is the hope that, if the intermediary Anglican could swallow up the distinctly Protestant bodies, then the holy Roman Church might absorb the Anglican and its contents.

In this connection it is not unfair to notice certain editorial language in the *Church Review*, which seems to throw light on its concep-

tion of the position held by the Church of England and her American daughter. The editor speaks of "reunion between the Anglican communion on the one hand and the Protestant communions on the other;" he says that "the Protestants have accused the Anglicans of disagreeing among themselves;" he refers to the "inviting of ministers of the Protestant Churches into Episcopal pulpits"—expressions which indicate that the *Church Review* does not class the Episcopal body among Protestant communions. Such phraseology tends to justify the words of an eminent English Nonconformist, the Rev. Dr. R. F. Horton, recently spoken in New Haven, "The Anglican Church is Roman and mediæval. But for it the Churches in England would be united to-day." Even more definitely grim and bitterly severe is a late utterance of Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, who takes a gloomy view of the condition and tendencies of the English Church. These are his words: "The whole cause of the Reformation is going by default; and if the alienated laity, who have been driven into indifference by the Romish innovations and Romish doctrines forced upon them without any voice of theirs in the matter, do not awake in time and assert *their rights as sharers in the common and sole priesthood of all Christians*, they will awake to find themselves nominal members of a Church which has become widely popish in all but name—a Church in which catholicity is every day being made more and more synonymous with stark Romanism, and in which the once honored name of Protestant is overwhelmed with calumny and insult."

In the Anglican communion are antagonistic parties. The reunion propositions which originated with one party were modified and, as far as possible, checked by the opposing party. How this was done at Lambeth is clearly shown in the article on "A Suppressed Chapter of Recent Church-History" in this issue of our *Review*. In our judgment and for our present purpose the chief value of that article is, that it reveals the existence and strength of a party within the Church of England and its branches in favor of repudiating High Church claims and accompanying all overtures for union with the avowal of readiness to recognize the validity of non-Episcopal ordinations and the entire parity of other Protestant bodies with the Anglican. We call attention to that party, to what it has done and is doing, and record our faith that the future belongs to it; its battle, "though baffled oft, is ever won." This party, with a petition signed by thirty-two bishops and over a thousand of the clergy, procured the framing and adopting of the original overtures at Chicago. It carried its cause to Lambeth, and, in the Committee on Reunion, consisting of seventeen bishops, it was strong enough to add to the Chicago action a proposition to recognize non-Episcopal orders. Although it was allowed no voice in the *Church Review* it continues to speak and can never be silenced. Its colossal champion in the United States was that superb embodiment of Christian manliness, that great gift of a gracious God to the breed of little men, that man of wide vision and large love whom we knew as Phillips Brooks; a man whose convictions and disposition were indicated in his addressing an assembly of Congrega-

tional clergymen as "Beloved brother ministers;" a man of such noble and stalwart proportions in personality and influence that, when he died, the universal sorrow of the American people made the continent his bier.

About the time the *Church Review* was declaring it to be no longer possible for anybody in the Anglican communion to deny apostolic succession, the most venerated and influential rector in the city of Brooklyn, speaking on church unity from the pulpit of Holy Trinity, said that the Episcopal Church had gone too far in its advances toward reunion ever to turn back, and that the only authority it could lay claim to was that of "love and a sound mind;" that the Presbyterians and Episcopalians would have little difficulty in coming together except on the question of the episcopate, and, with a little common sense and willingness to hold the views of the old English Churchmen who went to the Continent after the Reformation and greeted the Reformers with reverence as fellow-ministers, that difficulty would soon vanish.

The same sentiment was manifested by word and action when Phillips Brooks and Dr. E. Winchester Donald participated in the installation of Dr. Lyman Abbott as the successor of Henry Ward Beecher in the pastorate of Plymouth Church, and Dr. Donald said, "We are here openly, and are ready to meet any competent authority which may be pleased to inquire into our right to be here and extend as Christian ministers our greetings to other Christian ministers. I want to say in the most explicit terms that I stand as an Episcopalian minister and High Churchman, if you choose to call me so, and extend my greetings to Dr. Abbott and Mr. Bliss as ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, in every respect spiritually competent to preach the word of God and to administer the two sacraments which belong to the Church." This sentiment spoke again when Dr. S. D. McConnell, of Philadelphia, said to the Presbyterian Union of New York city, "What is wanted is organic union, and it is possible. The four principles laid down at Chicago and Lambeth as a basis are not an *ultimatum*, but only a memorandum." The same fraternal longing found utterance in the Lichfield Diocesan Convention in England, last spring, in an applauded motion favoring reunion between the Church of England and the Nonconformist bodies by the recognition of all those ordained in non-Episcopal communions as true ministers of Christ.

The reunionists in the Anglican body are earnest and irrepressible, undiscouraged by defeat—a minority which means to become a majority and will persist until it does. Beyond what it has accomplished in stirring up sentiment and procuring action in its own Church, the sympathetic responses which this party has evoked from other denominations prove that a sincere and powerful irenic spirit pervades the Protestant Churches. A Presbyterian suggests that if the Baptists would relax their close communion a union of that body with the Congregationalists would be possible. A Baptist is of opinion that the time ought not to be far away when there shall be a pan-Episcopal Church in which the Methodist and Protestant Episcopalians can consolidate. Not infrequently it is affirmed that many in the Presbyterian Church feel the defects of their form of gov-

ernment. Seeing the inefficiency of the presbytery for administrative purposes because of the lack of an executive head, they advocate the permanent setting apart of one chosen presbyter to the sole work of superintending the general affairs of the churches within each presbytery. Whatever name be given, this is diocesan episcopacy. If the day shall come when the obvious practical advantages of having certain necessary powers of decision and administration vested in one man rather than in a larger body are perceived by a ruling majority in the Presbyterian Church, and when extreme Calvinism is eliminated from its standards, as it is certain to be; and if, in that same day, the moderate Episcopalians who renounce apostolic succession and all similar pretensions obtain control of the Anglican Church in all its branches—what will then stand in the way of an organic union of Presbyterians and Episcopalians?

In Washington, on the 18th and 19th of last May, a significant official correspondence passed between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians, in which the Commission on Church Unity of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church wrote that the law relating to the episcopate is subject to alteration or amendment on grave occasions when the exigencies require; that the Episcopal body is ready to modify, if necessary, many things which it has most highly esteemed, including the law governing the episcopate; that it recognizes to-day the authority of the presbytery precisely as the English Presbyterians of 1660 asked that it should be recognized. The Commission added suggestions calculated to promote the growth of a mutual understanding and concomitant love, and to insure a "drawing together to the final attainment of corporate unity—the goal never to be lost sight of or in any way obscured"—so that everything possible may be done in the interest of Christian unity and the reorganization of American Christianity. To this offer of conciliatory concession and sacrifice the Committee on Christian Unity of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church replied, avowing a readiness to make similar sacrifices in order to the securing of Christian unity and to abandon any traditions, laws, or usages which, however dear and profitable, do not embody essential truth, substituting for them other forms, if thereby the healing of divisions might be promoted; adding that the General Assembly was not without hope of a satisfactory solution of the problem of reunion and would gladly cooperate in all wise and scriptural measures for the reorganization of the American Church.

We are aware that the fraternal movements to which we have been calling attention will be regarded in some quarters with scepticism and disfavor. It will be said that the current talk throughout Protestantism about organic union is a momentary craze, a *fin de siècle* fad, a vague, impractical wistfulness which will spend itself in talk; that a reaction will set in, the parties to the parley draw off and give themselves to their accustomed work in the old ways. Or we expect some church historian to raise an alarm against consolidation by undertaking to show that concentrated ecclesiastical unity has always meant concentrated ecclesiastical tyranny; but the facts he will cite would argue with equal force for the

division of those Christian bodies which have already grown very large. Against all imaginary objections the faith we are unwilling to relinquish compels us to look for a more perfect coordination of religious forces, by which sympathy shall banish antipathy and affectionate alliance do away with all remaining apathy and alienation. The divine Spirit is moving the hearts of men in all parts of the world toward ecumenical Christian fellowship. There is yearning for union among those who hold the evangelical essentials. A happy sense of spiritual unity spreads and deepens among the branches of Christ's family. Christendom feels along its shores a gulf stream warming chilly seas, melting icebergs, and making cold coasts bloom with summer. The strong and vital current now running through the different members of the Church catholic we hold to be an arterial outflow from the heart of Him who ever prays that all members of the Church, which is his body, may be one in him. In the religious thought and action of to-day we behold "onward-sloping motions making for one sure goal." We predict that the rising tide of intensely fraternal feeling, which the dullest observer can scarcely fail to see, will break the dikes somewhere and flow freely and far over fields which have shut themselves up in exclusiveness by guarded barriers of division. The final form results may take cannot be foreknown, nor the rate at which events will move; but effects, actual, valuable, and grand, are as certain as the sunrise is when, in the eastern sky, God begins to make for himself a crimson "rose of dawn."

THE PROBLEM OF THE COLLEGE.

EDUCATIONAL organization is undergoing some changes which are witnessed with pride by all persons interested in American civilization. These changes tend to the creation of great American universities; and it is a delightful promise that in a quarter of a century we shall be able to furnish all higher education in our own country. But this admirable movement is in some danger of becoming a centralizing one. There is a true saying, which is only relatively true, that "we have too many colleges." The sense intended is that our too small resources are expended upon too many attempts to found colleges. But if one considers the good one small college has done—if he take some one of the many for a study—he will come to feel that no small college can be spared. The ideal must be to build the university out of our resources and to keep every small college and enlarge its resources. The small colleges are already feeding the universities. The number of young men who after graduation at the small college resort to the universities is growing rapidly. It is safe to say that in ten years the annual number of such university students has doubled. In the very profitable discussion of this subject during the year we have not noticed any reference to the small college as a feeder of the university. The head of one of the small colleges tells us that, at the most moderate estimate, his college furnishes to better equipped institu-

tions more students than it graduates, and that the majority of these students would not graduate at any college if this particular small college did not exist. So far is this college from depriving the richer ones of students that precisely the reverse is true. This testimony may be taken as evidence that the future university is to be made possible by the missionary work of four or five hundred small colleges in close contact with the villages and the farms. A close observer will find that the new colleges of the last quarter century have not impaired the patronage of the older colleges. A new college behaves very much as a new Methodist church behaves—creates a new patronage. The creation of new colleges is not to be feared so much as the creation of new universities. For the equipment of a college to educate two hundred students a relatively small amount of money suffices; but there is no limit to the demands on the treasury of a great university. The benevolence which builds the small college would not be extended to the university. The college and its product are clear gains from the first, and a new college in the midst of a considerable population should be welcomed as a new civilizing force, as a new mission station for liberal education.

It would be an invidious task to fix the relative values of the education given in the small and in the large colleges; but it may be suggested that there is already an interplay between the small college and the university. The college sends its graduates to the university and gets its professors from the university. This interchange has begun, and it is sure to go on increasingly. Under this interaction, whatever may have been the relative merits formerly, the values of college education in large and small institutions must tend to an equality. The advantages to the university arising from the work of small colleges are so obvious to the experienced eye that it would not surprise us if, by and by, a great university should undertake the founding of small colleges through which to replenish its own student body.

The line between college and university is not yet finally determined. President Adams, then of the Cornell University, suggested, a few years ago, that this line should be drawn about the end of the sophomore year. Much might be done by broad-minded leaders in education, thoroughly in sympathy with both college and university education, if they would seriously address themselves to the task of so arranging the lines that the college might attain its highest usefulness and expend no force in competition with the university. There is a problem of the college, and a part of it is to find the proper end of college work. Another large part of this problem is set for us in a kind of despondency felt by men in the small colleges, and caused, they affirm, by the tendency to regard their work as an impertinent interfering with the functions of wealthy institutions. There is also some cause to fear that local springs of benevolence in this kind are somewhat retarded in their flow by the spectacle of the rivers of gold flowing into universities. The American mind glorifies the colossal, and even in the rural village the man of means likes to do some great thing. But we can no more dispense with the small college than we can

abolish the small church. The strength of the future university will be discounted by any tendency to eliminate the college and leave the universities to be recruited from the public schools. Four hundred small colleges may furnish ten thousand university students in A. D. 1925.

WHAT ARE THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH?

THE question put in another form might read, "Has the Church a mission to the individual only, or to society at large as well?" No thoughtful person would deny the influence of the Church upon society in general. But it is certainly as yet the prevailing belief that this influence is and ought to be through its influence upon the individual. Through her various agencies the Church reaches and molds the life of the convert, and the number of converts thus brought and held under the power of the Gospel measures and conditions her influence upon the community. Every soul won from a wicked life and brought under the sway of the kingdom of God weakens by so much the forces of evil and enlarges equally the preponderance of good. The motive which has prompted effort in soul-winning has not been the uplifting of society, but the salvation of the individual—the immortal being exposed to eternal condemnation and misery, and therefore to be rescued from the destiny toward which he is hastening with rapid strides. But seldom does the interest extend beyond the individual to the society of which he forms a part. Thought has centered about the ideal man, while the ideal kingdom of God has been forgotten. Sometimes, indeed, patriotic considerations furnish an argument in favor of home missionary endeavor, and occasionally reforms are advocated in the name of a philanthropy broad enough to embrace all mankind. Yet the general fact remains that it is the individual, and not the society, which the Church directly seeks to reach and improve.

Not only so. Protestantism has largely confined its efforts to the purely religious and moral development of the individual. If there is any broad and significant exception it is in the educational agencies which the Church has fostered. It has been felt that if the Church redeems one from the power of sin and imparts to him aspirations commensurate with the dignity of his nature she has done all that lies in her province to do. He can then enter the struggle of life with more than an even chance of success. Such sentiments have not held control in the Church by mere accident. They are the result of a careful estimate of values as drawn from the gospel scheme. Jesus came into the world to save sinners. It is for them that he died. He relieved temporal distress of every kind during his public ministry, but it was incidental to his great mission of calling sinners to repentance. It is because the Master thought of men under the two mutually exclusive categories of the saved and the unsaved that the Church has continued to do the same. The Church is the one institution upon earth which represents the divine compassion toward the

spiritually lost. To rob herself of this peculiarity would be to abdicate her throne of glory.

We have here, then, two distinguishing characteristics of the work of the Protestant Church: first, her emphasis of the individual, and, second, the limitation of her efforts to the individual's moral and religious regeneration and life. The latter involves the former. Men cannot be saved in masses, but only as individuals. The whole Protestant idea is that each soul has its independent relation to God. The Church as such is of small moment. It is an organization of individuals, but it can guarantee salvation to none of its members. Its theory is not that God saves the Church, but that he saves souls. Hence each soul is not only responsible directly to God, but also has its rights as against the Church. No man's conscience can be overpowered by any organization. The sacred right of individual liberty is a fundamental principle of Protestantism.

As a consequence there is in the Church such a development of individualism as to endanger her unity. The centrifugal forces are almost as strong as the centripetal. Yet the danger is not as great as it seems. Had there been a competent yet uninstructed observer of the processes by which the nebulous masses which now form the systems of the universe were separated into numberless smaller ones and compacted into their present form, he would have seen with pain the breaking up of the attenuated matter into independent fragments. He would have mourned that each was becoming self-centered and taking its own peculiar form. To his mind it would probably have appeared far more seemly that there should be one great body of matter—unity, even at the loss of variety. But if the same observer could have watched the processes of systematization, could he have seen the worlds fall into their orbits and swing in perfect harmony around their common center, he would have felt that the apparent anarchy was only the preparation for a far more glorious unity. A system of worlds, each a unit, and yet together forming a higher unit, is a more attractive illustration of perfect harmony than a single world containing the material of all worlds. Such a system will Protestant Christianity become. At present the individualizing tendencies are relatively too prominent. The denomination and the individual are too self-centered. Each must learn his place in the system, and so feel the force of the central sun as to keep his place and perform his part. This will not only correct the excessiveness of individual self-consciousness, but will enable the Church to look at masses of men, at society as a whole.

What, then, are the functions of the Church aside from the salvation of the individual! To secure a correct answer let us ask what course Christ pursued. He came to seek and save the lost. But for this he had not come into the world. Yet his efforts were not confined to the alleviation of spiritual woe. He was a philanthropist and statesman as well as a Redeemer. The philanthropy of Jesus will not be denied; but his statesmanship may not at first sight be so evident. His purpose to affect the State might be inferred from the fact that he has affected it wherever he has been preached. Yet this would not sufficiently prove that such

was his purpose. For this it is necessary to examine his doctrines. The result of such an investigation is plainly in favor of the view that he had in the plane of his vision not merely the individual, but the State and the world. He taught his disciples to perform their duties to the State; he defined the relation of the kingdom of God to the same, and affirmed that his rulership in the hearts of men was not in conflict with the rights of the earthly ruler. His ethics were so constructed as to lift men above mere casuistry and establish principles of conduct as suitable for national as for individual life. If his teachings are followed nations no more than individuals may be innocently godless; and international policy is as much amenable to his behests as the conduct of individuals toward each other. In a number of instances Jesus not only defined his attitude toward the State, but laid down principles which it must ultimately accept. If this be true the Church, which is the representative of Christ, must take its position on all questions of morals influencing the welfare of the State, its obligations to God and to other nations. The doctrine of the separation of Church and State is often so construed as to imply that the Church must confine its functions solely to the spiritual and moral renovation of the individual, while to the secular arm and the secular judgment is committed the conduct of national affairs. This error is enforced by a failure to distinguish between Christianity and the Gospel. The relation of the two is not that of identity, but of the whole to one of its parts. The Gospel is indeed the good news of the redemption by the blood of Christ. But Christianity is a far more comprehensive idea, embracing everything which pertains to human conduct and destiny. The Church has no more glorious mission than that of proclaiming to souls in bondage to Satan the deliverance offered by Christ. But it is impossible for the Christian to do his Master's will and at the same time be obedient to a Christless State. This was soon discovered by the authorities of the Roman empire, and the struggle for supremacy was inevitable. Christianity must either transform or overthrow the power of Rome. In three hundred years the former was accomplished. On purely partisan questions the Church may be silent, only doing what she can to abate the animosities of political campaigns. But upon the principles involved, so far as they are of a moral kind, the Church must speak, if not in her legislative capacity at least through her pulpits. The cry of the politician to "keep politics out of the pulpit" springs from the feeling that Christian morals and political principles are often inconveniently at variance.

But not alone on questions which have become partisan, but also on all matters relating to the welfare of men, the Church should commit herself and be active. So far as temperance, slavery, marriage and divorce, polygamy, and many other reforms are concerned, this has been done in recent years with no uncertain sound. Yet there are other interests not so clearly connected with the moral welfare of the people concerning which the Church has too long been silent. It is safe to say that the Church has never yet applied herself to the study of social and economical questions. Individual cases of distress she has gladly relieved; and it is

false to assert that the Church has not cared for the poor and unfortunate. Her whole history is a refutation of such a slander. But Christian principles have never been applied on a generous scale to the prevention of human misery. It is not enough to relieve cases of misfortune when they appear. Many of these need never appear if Christian principles prevail in society. There is something wrong in the system under which such fearful evils arise; and we may be sure that it is not the Christian features of the system which are to blame. Were our whole civilization informed by the spirit of Christianity every individual would hold a different position in society from that which he now holds. Questions of property, wages, taxes, are questions of equity and justice which the Church dare not neglect if she is to be the representative of the helpful spirit of Christ. Yet just because the Church has felt that her mission is spiritual and heavenly all such problems have been left far more to the study of seculars than of ecclesiastics. It is not right in the hope of another world to forget the demands of this. Where this is done it is little wonder that those who feel the curse of a wrong system upon them cry out against the Church for its indifference to their situation. Eleemosynary institutions are well enough, but the Church should see to it that henceforth there be less need of them than heretofore.

One of the strongest evidences that the Church has had too narrow a conception of her mission is that so many organizations distinct from the Church are formed to carry forward efforts of a Christian character. Why, for example, should there be any need in a Christian country for a separate organization for the rescue of fallen women? It is simply because the Church has not felt that for this or for any other class of unfortunates she is specially responsible. Such as came to her altars with proper evidence of repentance she would accept, but left it to others to provide on any large scale for their rescue. Yet if any work could represent the spirit of Christ Jesus it is to seek and save these lowest of the lost. Penal institutions should perhaps be left entirely to the State to support, although even here the Church should make her influence felt in the principles of their management. Nor should reformatory institutions and hospitals be thrown upon the Church alone for support, especially where voluntary contributions are her only source of income. But the Church as such should either establish, or cause to be established, institutions looking toward the rescue of all the exposed classes from the clutch of the tempter. The open saloon, which as often stands for good-fellowship as for dissipation, should be met, not by another saloon, but by a place of assembly equally free of access, and as inviting in its appointments as it is possible to make it, where men may meet and gratify their love of congenial society. A Christian temple whose precincts are too sacred for such uses is dedicated to some other god than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is the bane of our ecclesiastical architecture that it symbolizes and is adapted chiefly to the purposes of devotion. In consequence none enter the Church except such as feel some distinctively religious need. Upon all others we fail to have any direct influence what-

ever. Christianity must seek with mighty and increasing energy to turn men from sin to holiness. But if it cannot do this must it have no mission to them whatever? Must men feel that the Church cares nothing for the unconverted except as she hopes to convert them? We may indeed mourn that any should love our Lord so little that, while enjoying the privileges of the church reading room, he would wholly absent himself from the prayer room. But are we accomplishing any better work when we close up our reading room and allow him to seek his literature outside of the Church? Will he therefore feel the more kindly toward our Lord? The human wants of which Jesus took cognizance were far more comprehensive than those of the soul. So far as it lies within her power the Church should meet these broad demands of humanity. Were this ideal realized the multitudes would follow the Church even as they did our Lord, who would not turn them away though they desired only to be fed on the loaves and fishes. The beneficial effects of this principle are finding recognition in foreign missionary work, where the Christian school-teacher and medical missionary prepare the hearts of the people for the reception of the Gospel. Even in Christian lands the first condition of successful effort on the part of a Church is that it possess the affections of the people. To this end it must show itself in sympathy with the needs of mankind, whatever they may be. And this does not transcend the proper functions of the Church of God. The prevailing idea that only in securing men's spiritual development does the Church have her legitimate sphere of action is a reminiscence of the old ascetic belief that everything is sinful which is not directly connected with the relation of the soul to God. Both proposition and corollary are false.

The Church of to-day needs to awake to the fact that she must compete for the souls of men. As never before the forces of wickedness and of worldliness are organized. The natural man has an affinity for the world and for wickedness which he does not have for the Gospel. The avenues of approach to his soul on those sides which the Church neglects are far more numerous and open than toward the Gospel. We insist upon the Gospel; he insists upon his worldly wants. We have nothing to offer which he desires. The result is that he is alienated from Christ more and more. This we charge to the hardness of his heart, and with truth: but perhaps we could soften his heart by another method. If we offered him some other good which he could appreciate it may be that we could win his confidence so that he would listen when we seek also the welfare of his soul. It is a plan that has worked well when tried by individual Christians. Why should it not be efficacious when undertaken by the Church as an organized body? We need abate none of our earnestness in the effort to save men from sin. Nay, we must rather increase these efforts, and that by employing a greater variety of methods adapted to a greater variety of characters than heretofore. On a larger scale than in the past we must follow the principle of John Wesley and deny Satan the exclusive right to the good things of this life. If we leave all these things to be furnished by the world we strengthen by so much the world's

hold upon our youth and weaken by so much our own. Not only so. We show that there is in our minds a divorce between the legitimate affairs of life and Christianity. This is fatal to all true piety. It is upon just such an idea as this that the maxim, "Business is business, and religion is religion," is based. Furthermore, we expose the lives of the people to influences not controlled by the spirit of Christ. If the Church does not furnish amusement the world will; and, rather than not be amused, most people will attend entertainments from which they would stay away if purer and more elevating ones were offered. We cannot offer a church card table, nor a church theater, nor a church dance without placing ourselves exactly on a level with the world and destroying the distinction which should here be maintained. But there are other amusements which are just as pleasing to the majority. Any congregation that will can compete with the world in furnishing entertainments for its adherents. They can do it without descending to that which is debasing and without any interference with evangelistic efforts. If by entering into competition we can hold the masses true to the Church is it not plainly a duty to do so?

But the question reaches wider still. In every large city there are thousands of young men and women who have aspirations far beyond the range of their opportunities. Many of these belong to the Churches. They are anxious to become stenographers, telegraphers, bookkeepers, and to accomplish themselves in music, drawing, elocution, etc. Is there not here a field for church activity? Every such occupation acquired becomes an added source of power and influence. The Church develops her own resources by encouraging all these things. But in most cases all provision for such advancement is left to outside benevolent enterprise. In many instances the Young Men's or Young Women's Christian Associations furnish the facilities needed. The result is that those receiving the benefits feel more kindly toward these institutions than toward the Church. The former have befriended them, the latter has not. Why should the Church forfeit all these opportunities for winning the affections of the people? Why give men over for so large a portion of their time to influences which are often both in rivalry and in opposition to us? Our church edifices could with very little modification be adapted to a greater variety of purposes than they now are. There is scarcely anything of the kind now suggested which would not pay its own expenses from the very beginning. Few churches are so poorly provided that they could not furnish or enlist the necessary talent. Only the feeling that such efforts on the part of the Church are within her sphere seems lacking. Let the splendid organization of the Epworth League be an illustration of what can and ought to be done. Projected upon this broad Christian principle, the languishing work of many a downtown church about to be abandoned would revive, and the masses would begin to feel that in the Church they have a friend. The favor bestowed is small in comparison with the salvation of the soul. But even a cup of cold water may be given in the name of Christ, and those who in his name minister to the temporal good of men shall not lose their reward.

PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

THE pursuit of knowledge is the master passion of mankind. In some sense ignorance always seems a reproach. The human mind is a perpetual interrogation point. Nor does it put inquiries merely for the idle sport of asking questions, without expectation that they may be answered. Every mystery in nature is a standing challenge to the intellectual man; every wonder in revelation is a defiance to his skill and a call to investigation. There is no closed gate which the scholar does not seek to open and through which he does not ardently wish to walk. The very uncertainty of what lies in the untrodden fields beyond gives zest to his pursuit and activity to his imagination. And that there are yet many closed gates should be one of the satisfactions of the student. Only intellectual sluggards can regret the existence of mysteries in the universe. Through experiment and struggle is the scholar to enter into his kingdom. In harmony with this view the unceasing diligence of the investigator is one of the satisfactory spectacles of the times. He is not abashed to confess his ignorance, since this confession is one of the first steps to knowledge. In that humility which becomes men who have much to learn he is as one who has but mastered the alphabet. Never in the history of mental research has true scholarship been more modest in its professions. But its zeal keeps pace with its humility. Every department seems to vie with the others in the untiring application of its specialists. In theology the review of all the fields of early New Testament history, the textual study of every Hebraic and Greek manuscript, and the revision of every definition of systematic theology seem the order of the day. Always a noble pursuit, because of the weighty interests of man the immortal which are involved, the study of theology was never more inviting or promissory of rewards to the inquirer. Astronomy is likewise alert. Feeling its privilege to review all that Ptolemy and Copernicus, Tycho Brahe and Kepler, Herschel and Fraunhofer have left as truth, and thankful for all the deductions of these leaders in its department, its gaze is still upward to learn the ultimate certainties. No eclipse nor meteoric shower nor distant asteroid goes unnoticed. We cannot limit the future of astronomy even by its past. Concerning the immeasurable stretches of space whose very mention is awe-inspiring, and the constellations which gleam in distant beauty in the firmament, what wonders will our children's children not know in the coming century! Geology, archæology, paleontology, ethnology, botany, and chemistry—all of them most sublime and engaging pursuits—are also at white heat in their investigations and experiments. One covets the opportunities for specialism in each of these departments, so broad is the field for inquiry and so certain the harvest yield. And what shall be said of the advance of medicine? In its various sub-departments the progress is marvelous. The surgeon is learning the possibilities of operation upon vital organs that but a few years ago it would

have been reckoned madness to touch. The germs of hitherto unexplainable diseases are being discovered. Hydrophobia seems to be mastered. Wonderful additions to *materia medica* are made, and human life, that always precious inheritance, is put at greater premium. The ultimate truth in all departments is worth the effort. All hail to the progressing scholarship of the world!

WITH the skill of a great commander Mr. Gladstone seems to be advancing the interests of Home Rule toward their consummation. Though a lull has come for a little in the great agitation, the cause, like all others which involve the rights of humanity, is immortal. As though it were altogether lodged in the person of the "grand old man," its opponents have somewhat lately heaped upon its champion their contumely. Like a chapter from the old books of the martyrs seems the story of the burning of Mr. Gladstone's effigy in the streets of Belfast, or the record of other indignities with which his excited adversaries have requited him. In his green old age, when honorable service and accumulated honors would seem to justify his retirement, this octogenarian is fighting the battle of his life for Irish autonomy. Neither effigies nor the hootings of mobs alarm his intrepid soul. Were his life's blood the crowning demand made of him in the prosecution of his sublime idea he would pay the price with a martyr's courage. Life has but little more for him in years. To walk the path of death for others would be to follow Paul and Polycarp and Huss, and more of the world's greatest heroes. Yet no moral reform can die with the individual. Though Stephen was martyred and Peter thrown into the dungeon the Christian religion grew and flourished. Because Galileo was haled before the Inquisition true science was not eclipsed or overthrown. What if Luther and Bunyan were imprisoned? Still the truth moved on. The cause of Livingstone and Hannington still lives in Africa. The "soul" of the martyred John Brown went "marching on" with untiring course, accomplishing what the living John Brown could never have effected, until slavery was trodden under foot by an indignant nation. To burn Mr. Gladstone in effigy, to assault his person, to put him to martyrdom, is not to end the cry for Home Rule. Though in the judgment of its adversaries it is not without its radical demerits, yet it takes its place with the great moral reforms of history. Such principles are greater than individuals. For their preservation the sleepless sentinels of God stand upon the watch until the daybreak.

Or the publishing of many books there is no end. The statement lately made that nearly five thousand new volumes were issued during 1892—the number being an increase of more than two hundred books over the total of the preceding year—is a surface argument that is full of promise for the progress of literature. In no age since the invention of type and of the later facilities for cheap and rapid publication has the printing press exerted a more commanding influence over home and society. It

rouses the tenderest sentiments to activity; it incites to indignation over wrong-doing; it stirs to daily accomplishment. Whoever writes the list of the forces that shape our nineteenth-century life must put foremost among these influences the printing press. In the present instance the classification by departments of the five thousand new volumes for the past year affords instructive lessons. Probably it will cause no surprise that, in the enumeration of publications for 1892 made by the *Publishers' Weekly*, fiction leads the list. Some 1,102 volumes, or nearly a quarter of the total of the new issues, are included in this division. Among the remaining classes the religious department embraces 502 new volumes; law, 374; poetry, 259; biography, 234; travel, 192; history, 165; arts, 128; philosophy, 33; and humor, 31. The catalogue is worthy of more than passing study. That but thirty-three new books have been added to the department of philosophy does not, at least on the surface, argue for the conservation of intellectual vigor on the part of the American nation. Now, as heretofore, it is easy to count upon the fingers the lovers of metaphysical or scientific inquiry. The dust gathers quickly upon the treatises of scholars in the department wherein Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* is a conspicuous ornament. There is always foothold and to spare in the sphere where Hegel and Cousin moved as untiring and peerless investigators. The nation, it is evident, is consumed by no burning love for philosophy. Perhaps its indifference is explained in part by the more practical demands of the age to which it belongs; but certain it is that one of the inspiring departments of intellectual research is an untrodden domain to the great majority of American readers. In the conviction that the cultivation of the philosophical tastes tends in part to the greatness and progressiveness of national life we can but deplore the showing which the tabulation affords. But, passing from philosophy to other departments, the issue of 165 volumes in the department of history and of 234 in the field of biography inspires a greater degree of encouragement. The two departments go hand in hand. All biography is true history; all history, in its final analysis, is the kaleidoscopic grouping of individual biographies. Hence both departments are invaluable. Human life is a perpetual circle. The past interprets the present. A nation that has time in its pressing employments to commune with individuals and governments which have passed from the stage cultivates a most intelligent view of existence. Many of the historical volumes which have been issued in the past year have treated, we infer, of epochs in eastern and ancient experience; and those who have read have broadened their horizon forever. Among the biographies of the past year the life-stories of Christian heroes, of godly women, of self-sacrificing missionaries, have been included, and such characters never die. Their influence sweeps all continents and permeates all centuries. The American nation has been benefited in the addition of these late life-sketches to biographic literature. As to the issue of fiction, the reactionary movement which has already begun in France has hardly made a corresponding impression among ourselves. A few of these latest romances, we suppose, are good;

many are probably passable, without particular moral lessons; not a few are likely the portrayals of impossible situations on the part of impossible heroes, are tainted with inelegances or even vulgarities of utterance, or are couched in the labored and grandiloquent verbiage of the hack-writer. Whoever watches the stream of novels that pours from the perennial fountain-head of publication must regret the issue of much that flows forth broadcast upon its poisonous errand. The excessive patronage of the department of fiction in our public libraries is not a wholesome sign. All right thinkers must deplore the reading of so much that is enervating, and hope for its speedy extermination. Yet the American people read. Reading makes "the full man." In the enlarging issue of printed books lies a prophecy of the universal spread of knowledge.

THE Commencement season has returned again in the cycle of the year. Without variation, save in relatively minor details, the experiences of this festival week have reproduced themselves as they have come for the past century to the American graduate. Under the campus trees the alumnus with his whitening hair has wandered—older by many pages in the almanac and wiser by many contacts with the jostling world than when he first walked those shades a graduate. In awe-inspiring conclave the boards of trustees have again surveyed the interests of their universities and have set into operation enactments that will advance still further the interests of higher education. Out upon the fragrant air of June the strains of the college roundelay have rung. Awarded have been the last prizes of undergraduate life, and forth into the great world has trooped the liberated and elated host, dreaming over again the old dream of service, success, and imperishable fame! Whoever has once trod the Commencement stage, when life was new and sweet, is in harmony with the season and is a brother forever to this new company that now enrich the public life. Commencement—*talismanic word!* An oasis is it in the arid desert of too many crowded lives; a halt in the weary climb toward the summits; a song in the prosaic round of official service. Rich is the man who has had in his soul-development the molding influences of a Commencement season! But after Commencement, what? The question should not be lightly dismissed. The prime responsibilities of life are on the graduate. *Noblesse oblige.* To have been awarded a diploma from Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, or any of the goodly company of Wesleyan Universities means that one should fight in the front rank the battle with unrighteousness. The world never expected greater things of the alumnus. He must be in the highest sense a noble man. He should do nothing in a desultory, a selfish, an unworthy way. While desiring to speak of the many glorious opportunities for worldly success that open before the graduate, we may at present only refer to the moral quality of his service. In medicine, the law, commerce, letters, or the ministry the uttermost is expected of him. Unto "whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more." The seal of responsibility is set upon the very forehead of the university graduate.

THE ARENA.

THE ORDER FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP.

BISHOP GOODSSELL, in the January number of the *Review*, has a very suggestive article entitled "Whither?—A Study of Tendency." The bishop's opportunities for observing the tendencies in the Church qualify him for speaking on such a subject and entitle his opinions to careful consideration. On page 17 he says: "I note, secondly, the manifest tendency toward a greater participation on the part of the people in the exercise of public worship. Against all protests, fears, and hysterics, the ritual in some form has come to stay." Again he says: "There is a distinct tendency toward unity in and around the Anglican Prayer Book."

There can be no valid objection to this goal whither the tendency is carrying us, since the Anglican Prayer Book has stood the test of time as a manual of devotion, and is hallowed by a thousand sacred charms and associations. Mr. Wesley declared it, in his opinion, the best ever used in the Church; and, somewhat modified and abridged, it was adopted as the legal order of public worship when the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. Mr. Wesley himself prepared an edition of it, and sent it to America when he sent Dr. Coke with letters of episcopal authority to organize the Church. This book, entitled *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America, with Other Occasional Services*, the Conference of 1784 adopted for the use of the Church which was then organized. This was one of the acts of the organizing Conference, and was a part of the Constitution of the Church; and it was as much ordained that the new organization should be a liturgical as that it should be an episcopal Church. The bishops and elders proceeded at once to use the liturgy which was thus provided. Its discontinuance in the ordinary Sunday services was gradual, and not on account of any legislation repealing its use, but because of the primitive condition of the country, the difficulty of providing and distributing the books, and the inconveniences attending many of our congregations, most of which were compelled to meet in private houses and other places ill adapted to the orderly forms of public worship.

Now, since there is a distinct tendency toward the Anglican Prayer Book, as Bishop Goodsell has shown, why should not our bishops and others in places of authority and influence seize the opportunity to direct this tendency and so secure the uniformity in our public worship so long desired but not yet obtained? Probably not one half our ministers now conform strictly to the order laid down in Chapter V, Part I, of the Discipline. Some sin by omission, others by commission. One congregation uses the Psalter, another recites the Creed and sings the Gloria Patri, while another "enriches the service" in some other way. Some ministers fail to repeat the Lord's Prayer, and so on.

The Methodist Episcopal Church was the first in America to adopt a prayer book after the independence of the United States had terminated

the authority of the Anglican Church in this country, and all later comers are mere copyists and imitators. Why should not our book agents issue an edition of the *Sunday Service*? Then all those ministers and congregations that are "enriching the service" in various ways could use this book, prepared by the original Methodist, our venerable founder, for the use of the Methodists in America. There can be no legal objection to the restoration of the *Sunday Service*, since the law which ordained its use has never been repealed. Its use would not be an innovation in our system. It is entirely competent, therefore, for the book agents to publish the book and for any of our congregations to use it. By this means it would gradually come into use in all our congregations.

There can be no doubt that this would be an advantage to the Church in many ways. Our Church has not ceased to be a great evangelizing agency—God forbid it should!—but it is now far more than that, because it has been such an agency. It has a large duty of caring for and edifying the millions gathered into its fold through its great revivals and providing for their nurture in the Church which brought them to Christ. Since there is a manifest tendency on the part of the people toward a greater participation in public worship, the Church should take notice of this fact; and since the tendency is toward a prayer book, the adoption of the *Sunday Service* would evidently be the providential means of supplying the want. And especially is this so since the conditions which caused the book to fall into disuse no longer exist.

There is a dignity and solidity attending the use of a liturgy which does not attend an extemporized service; while many prayers offered in our pulpits on the occasion of public worship are sadly deficient as an expression of the people's wants. The average man is swayed more or less by his moods and tenses even in public prayer; and now and then—seldom, let us hope—the minister castigates a delinquent congregation when he is ostensibly supplicating the throne of grace in their behalf.

In many congregations, even at the morning service, one fails to hear prayer offered for "the President of the United States and all others in authority," while "all sorts and conditions of men" are left out, except the mere handful present; and often there is no general confession, without which the morning prayer is incomplete. Surely we need some better guide or directory for public worship under these circumstances. The use of a liturgy would cure these defects.

It should be borne in mind that the employment of a liturgy has never fallen into disuse among us for special occasions, but only for the regular Sunday services. It would be but a step, therefore, to the restoration of the *Sunday Service* for morning and evening worship, as recommended by Mr. Wesley. This would be a return to the provision made by the first Conference, which sent out Francis Asbury as the first bishop consecrated in America, with this historic liturgy in his hands, to organize and direct what has become the great American Church. The restoration of the liturgy would gratify our most intelligent and loyal people, and would be a means of education to all in genuine love, respect, and reverence for

the Church. The want of a ritual is manifest in most of our city congregations, in many of which some innovation is made upon the bald forms of our ordinary service. Richard Watson believed a mixed service, combining freedom and liturgy, the best for the Church. We may and ought so to provide that there would be no need of further innovation to meet the wants of our people. The restoration of the *Sunday Service* would make its historic prayers, fragrant with the odor of the sanctuary and consecrated by a thousand hallowed associations, the common heritage of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and so afford the best ritual for the remotest frontier church as well as for the great city congregations.

Probably other branches of Episcopal Methodism would follow our example, and the liturgy would become a bond of union that would hasten the day when the broken fragments of a once united Church would be again united, and so our reproach be taken away.

Hastings, Minn.

E. R. LATHROP.

WAGES AND PROFITS.

IN Dr. Todd's able article in the May-June number of this *Review*, while there is much to commend, there are also certain representations which appear to be open to criticism. I do not think that the inequalities in the relation of wages and profits are so great or so nearly universal as are claimed by him and by many of the popular agitators. Inequalities there are, and evils that call for redress; but let us not ignore any of the actual facts in the case. It is not the regularly employed wage-workers, as a class, that are the chief sufferers. One may properly enough sympathize with the weaker party in a fight; but after all it is always in order to inquire whether, in a given case, he is perfectly in the right. Our sympathies are more properly due to another party, so much weaker as to not be in the fight at all—"the submerged tenth," the unemployed, the casually employed, those whose earnings afford only the scantiest means of subsistence, who cannot combine or organize, who cannot strike or boycott, who have no "walking delegate," who do not cry nor lift up, and whose voice is not heard in the street.

Let us look at some of the clearly ascertained facts concerning wage-workers and employers. Dr. Todd's case of the cotton manufactory, I fear, is a fancy sketch rather than a concrete instance. His figures respecting the capital of the concern are to me somewhat confusing, and I cannot quite make out how much there really is. But it is clear enough that, in his opinion, if approximate justice prevailed in the distribution of the product the five hundred laborers would receive an average of \$460 each and the proprietors seven per cent on their working capital, or, as I figure it, in all a little more than six per cent on their whole investment. Now, \$460 is more than the ordinary average wages in a cotton factory amounts to if we reckon all the operatives, men, women, and children. But six per cent on his capital is also more than the stockholder in a cotton factory receives on the average. If he gets a dividend of four per cent per

annum, including interest on his investment, he is apt to feel pretty well contented; and if a well-established corporation yields much more than this the stock immediately goes above par, and by the time the dividend reaches eight or ten per cent its value doubles.

In the report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor and Wages for 1890 we find elaborately tabulated information on the whole subject of "net profits." It has cost years of toil, and all the reports from thousands of sources have been carefully analyzed and subjected to the most approved scientific tests. Their truth is beyond question. On this very subject of cotton manufacture we learn from this Report that there are in the State of Massachusetts 165 establishments. Of these there are reports concerning net profits from 137, of which 87 report net profits and 50 report no net profits. The capital of the former aggregates \$65,022,512; of the latter, \$36,822,437. The percentage of establishments and capital respectively is substantially the same. The net profits of the aggregate of the 137 establishments the Report represents as follows. It is usual in estimating net profits in business enterprises of this kind to allow five per cent for interest on capital, ten per cent for depreciation, and five per cent for selling expenses, bad debts, etc. But, says the Report: "If we make an allowance of one per cent for interest, two per cent for depreciation, and one per cent for selling expenses, it will leave 1.23 per cent net profit, equivalent to 0.65 per cent on the capital invested." It does not require much arithmetical ability to prove that in the cotton industry in Massachusetts even a not very high rate of wages would secure to the laborer a much larger income than a division of the product on the plan proposed by Dr. Todd.

Once more. This same Report informs us that in the 10,013 establishments investigated, comprising sixty-four separate industries, there were employed 419,956 laborers (including men, women, and children), and that the average wages of all these was \$351.02; and that had all the net profits been added to the wage fund and the net product divided equally among laborers, partners, and stockholders the share of each would have been \$349.47, or \$1.55 less than each laborer actually averaged, while each partner and stockholder would have received a little more than \$9 more than he actually did receive. Of course this does not touch the great army of the unemployed or of the casually employed, or the women at work in sweaters' shops. I apprehend it is to them that we might better turn our attention and our sympathies.

Dr. Todd insists that "the employers are partners in the losses which take place in business establishments." They suffer from the revulsions and depressions in trade; but what they suffer is lack rather than loss. But according to the proposed plan they would be compelled to participate in positive losses, and this would be a sore addition to their misfortunes.

It has been estimated that over ninety per cent of business enterprises fail sooner or later. I am not at all sure that this is true. But the certainty that a very large proportion fail makes it imprudent that poor men should risk their earnings in a general partnership instead of remain-

ing satisfied with an assured compensation, even if that were smaller than equity demands, as it sometimes certainly is. The profits of manufacturers are sometimes enormous, but such profits are rare.

Auburndale, Mass.

GEORGE M. STEELE.

CORRECTION OF DR. STRONG'S "SELF-CORRECTION."

ENGLISH meter has received from the ordinary English scholar so much less attention than Latin meter that it may be well to correct Dr. Strong's correction of himself in the matter of Mrs. Adam's favorite hymn, "Nearer, my God, to thee." He was right in the first place in regarding the meter as pure iambic, and his thought that it is dactylic is an error. It will be observed that the only variations from uniform iambic measure are in the first foot. But it is a recognized law in English meter, perfectly familiar to those who have cared to study the subject, that the first foot of an iambic line may be a trochee. The line "Nearer, my God, to thee," is simply one of three iambs, of which the first has been replaced by the permissible trochee. In any piece of blank verse (iambic pentameter) something like a quarter of the lines will begin with a trochee. Our hymns offer innumerable illustrations of the same license. As an example it may be sufficient to mention such lines as: "Arm me with jealous care," "Help me to watch and pray," "Soldiers of Christ, arise," "Early, my God, without delay." In all these cases where the scheme is iambic it is an error to regard the first foot as a dactyl. It would leave the fourth syllable hanging in the air.

WILLIAM HAYES WARD.

New York City.

THE MILLENNIUM.

INTERMINABLE difficulty stands in the way of those who persist in defining this term in a material sense. They will not admit that Christ's kingdom was inaugurated at his advent; that there were then fulfilled such scriptures as "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill Zión;" that the righteous branch foretold by Jeremiah was then raised unto David, whose fallen tabernacle was then built again; that Christ then ascended the throne as the eternal successor of David, to reign henceforth over spiritual Israel, and to gather into his kingdom those out of every kindred and nation who should own his sovereignty. Disciples to-day who put a more carnal construction upon the words "kingdom," "reign," and "conquest" are doomed to the same disappointment suffered by disciples in the days of Christ. "My kingdom is not of this world," said the Saviour. In no place throughout all his teachings does he refer to any future period when these hopes respecting a temporal reign shall be fulfilled; but all goes to the account of those who maintain the opposite, fortifying their argument for only an invisible and spiritual reign, which shall increase in influence and power until it shall pervade all nations and shall stretch "from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."

Guthrieville, Pa.

G. S. KERR.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

CONFERENCE STUDIES FOR THE QUADRENNIUM.

(Continued.)

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THEOLOGY is recognized as the foremost of the sciences. All its facts lie in the Bible and in the human consciousness. The formulation of these great facts by logical processes is the work of the systematic theologians. Biblical theology treats of these facts as they are recorded in the Scriptures, in relation to their environments. Systematic theology compares the doctrines which arise in exegetical studies and frames them into an harmonious system. Its study has won the homage of the profoundest minds in Christendom. No one can succeed in this department who is not sincerely reverent. He must also possess a logical and penetrating mind and have the instincts and the training of a philosopher. He needs, too, a familiarity with exegetical processes and results. It is a study for the mature intellect.

There is a tendency in these days to depreciate the study of systematic theology. It is a result of the trend of modern thought to discard formulation, especially in religion, and to apply itself chiefly to the practical. But surely the doctrine of the teaching concerning God cannot be lightly passed by. Who does not want to know what the Scriptures reveal concerning his nature and attributes, his will and character? These truths are found scattered here and there throughout his word as it has been unfolded from age to age. The harmony of these teachings during the progress of so many centuries is a proof alike of their correctness and of God's constant acting on the minds of his people in the communication of his truth.

There is no principle recognized among men as a basis of action which is not in a sense a doctrine. There is scarcely a volume that is written on any subject which is not in a certain sense the proclamation or advocacy of a doctrine. Whoever will dismiss doctrine from the world must at the same time expel truth from among mankind, for all truth is the expression of doctrine. Systematic theology, which is truth analyzed, harmonized, and formulated, is merely the doctrinal expression of the Holy Scriptures upon the most momentous subjects, and is therefore worthy of the study of all persons, especially of all preachers of the Gospel. That it is Bible truth systematized is no more to its discredit than it is to the discredit of natural science that it contains the laws of the universe as found in the world of physical nature. This study of systematic theology on the part of young preachers will not only awaken a deeper interest in all matters pertaining to religion, but it will also develop the intellect and stir the heart. For this study ample provision has been made in the new Disciplinary course. It is placed in its logical position immediately following the studies in exegesis.

In the first year systematic theology is to be studied. In the second year a particular department is considered, namely, Atonement in Christ. In the third year theological study is continued, Bishop Foster's *Supernatural Book* being the volume employed. In the fourth year the study is completed. Thus work in systematic theology continues during the whole course. The books studied are the latest and ripest productions which have appeared from our Methodist press; and the Church is to be congratulated on her productiveness in this great department.

The important problem for the young itinerant is that of the mastery of these large and at the same time compact works. In this regard two suggestions may be made. The one is to study by logical processes, endeavoring to find the standpoint of the author and to discover the mental movement by which the argument proceeds. Every great author has processes of reasoning peculiar to himself; and the ability to follow out these processes rather than to commit the book to memory is of primary importance in this study. Again, the student will find it very beneficial not to depend on the analysis, as found in the table of contents, however valuable and exhaustive it may be, but to make an analysis for himself. This method will at once stimulate the intellect and help the memory.

THE YOUNG MINISTER—THE PREPARATION.

WHEN the consciousness of a call to preach the Gospel has taken possession of the young Christian, and when he is convinced that he will best answer the call by a preparation for the sacred office, a further question arises, namely, what shall be the character and the extent of that preparation? He naturally begins to take counsel of his friends. Each one presents a different course of study. One will tell him to enter on the course prescribed in the Discipline for admission to Conference, claiming that this, with the Conference Course added, is entirely sufficient. Another will prescribe a college course, a third a college and theological seminary course, while a fourth would have him enter a theological school at once. The situation is exceedingly perplexing to a young man who wants information at the most critical period of his life.

It would be unwise to lay down a rule that will apply in all cases. Each one of the courses indicated has something in its favor. In general, it is safe to say that the first method mentioned is a mistake. There are few persons who cannot make a more extended preparation than that. Such an amount of study would admit him to the work of no other profession, and it should be adopted only in extreme cases and under the pressure of a great necessity for laborers. The Epworth League adopts courses of study more vigorous, and yet the young preacher is to teach those of whom the Epworth League is composed.

The second course, that of college preparation, is the one which very properly attracts the greatest attention. The desire for this is very great because one sees the importance of the training which the college or the university gives him for his contact with men in other walks of

life. College training is generally regarded as essential to what is designated as a liberal education, and therefore includes those branches which foster mental development. It is remarkable to note the unanimity with which certain studies have been agreed upon by educators as best adapted to promote intellectual training. The catalogues of the various universities and colleges show that substantially the same introductory studies and the same amount of work are required by all of them. It is true a few institutions have eliminated Latin and Greek from their requirements for admission, but the number is so small that they scarcely form an exception to the general rule. Mathematics, English grammar and composition, Latin and Greek, the elements of history and of one or two modern languages, constitute the essentials. It is to be observed that these studies are intended to promote education, or mental discipline, rather than to supply information. The young student must begin by developing his intellectual faculties, and thus far no studies have been found so well adapted to secure this end as mathematics and the ancient languages.

Here then the young student for the ministry must begin. He must submit to a course of drill. It must be slow. "Make haste slowly" is an adage in no sphere more applicable than in preparing for college. Constant review is the only safe rule, and all abnormal and hasty methods of advancement must be set aside if one would attain the best passport for his college life.

INTELLECTUAL RECREATION.

THERE is ever a distinction to be observed between earnest study and intellectual recreation. By study is meant the application of one's intellectual faculties to the subject in hand until it has been mastered or until a satisfactory conclusion has been reached. This kind of study is not easy, and is only possible in its full sense when one's powers have been well disciplined by a thorough preparatory course, and especially by careful training in the classics and mathematics. Genius has been defined as the power to hold the mind to a subject until it is viewed on all sides and comprehended in all its aspects.

This capacity is of very great value to a young preacher. The danger to which he is chiefly liable is intellectual dissipation. This is the carrying to excess that which we have designated as intellectual recreation. Such recreation is as necessary in its measure as physical recreation, but when it becomes a business, rather than a diversion, it assumes the nature of dissipation. It is very pleasant to read the many fascinating articles which are constantly appearing in the periodical press. Indeed, such is the extent to which magazine writing is carried that many of the ablest writers convey their choicest productions to the public in this way. The danger arises when these become the complete source of information rather than the complement of that which has been studied in other and more extended forms. This method is like taking an article in an average cyclopedia as conveying all needful information on its subject, instead of being, as it is intended to be, a mere outline.

The danger, however, does not consist merely in the fragmentary nature of such a method of study. It lies also in the tendency to do one's work in fragments of time, to get knowledge by employing odd hours and special moods, instead of securing it by hard and continued labor. Steadiness of application is as essential for a student's life as it is in any other career. Intellectual growth is only secured by learning to hold the powers steadily to a given subject with absolute, unflinching attention. It is implied in the adage, "Be a whole man to one thing at a time." Such study is more than a glance at an article when it arrests the attention. It is such an absorption in the theme as is only satisfied when one has passed from what is written to his own independent meditations and conclusions. Until this has taken place the conclusions reached cannot be satisfactory to the inquirer.

When study is turned into recreation there arises a kind of mental dissipation which is very injurious to the mental powers and is a serious obstacle to the acquisition of thorough knowledge. This danger should be specially guarded against by the young minister. He must give less time to the ephemeral productions of the day and more to the great works of great authors if he would continue to grow in intellectual vigor. He must be watchful lest his mornings, inadvertently, become entirely occupied with desultory reading. He must be careful lest some interesting subject divert him from his task and he find the day gone before his real work has been performed. He must see to it that the hours consecrated to study be not wasted on that which is not worthy of his time or of his powers.

This view by no means involves the neglect of the literature of the day. It means that every kind of intellectual employment should have its appropriate place, and that no kind or amount of general reading can be a substitute for earnest and faithful study. There is room, also, for recreation in literature, and the magazines of our time are exceedingly rich in that which is fitted to satisfy the highest and the purest taste.

THE PRESERVATION OF MATERIALS—ANOTHER WORD.

THE preservation of sermonic materials continues to be a subject full of interest, and still calls forth important notice from our readers. The following communication from Brother Lynch is self-explanatory and seems to contain some valuable suggestions:

EDITOR ITINERANTS' CLUB: In the January number of the *Review* Brother Hartley writes concerning this subject. I have another suggestion that I am certain will prove of great value to all who adopt it. It does away with the necessity of arranging a blank book or of troubling one's self about a possibly new and better method. It consists simply in purchasing a cheap little book called *The Bible Index*, copyrighted by John M. Stevenson and for sale by A. D. F. Randolph & Co., New York. This book is a veritable treasure to me, and I would not part with it for

any consideration were it impossible to procure another. It consists of a neat blank book, of very good quality of paper, ruled so as to provide for two thousand Scripture references. In the first column there is space for the insertion of the number to be posted in the Bible opposite to the verse commented upon. In the second column provision is made for a second reference and for any number of subsequent references. The third column is devoted to the Scripture text, and the last column has space for the book reference. Thus ruled its use is exceedingly simple. For instance, suppose the minister should be reading Townsend's *Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, on page 113. He would there find a passage that beautifully illustrates John i, 3. He instantly turns to his study Bible and places opposite the verse, on the margin, the figure 1, which means that the first passage commented upon in the *Bible Index* is John i, 3. Then in the *Bible Index* the minister writes in the third column, "John i, 3," and in the fourth column, "See Townsend's *Bible in the Nineteenth Century*." If the next day he should be reading Geikie's *Hours with the Bible*, vol. i, page 51, he would find an illustration for 1 Cor. xiii, 12, and would write on the margin of the study Bible the figure 2; in column three of *Bible Index*, 1 Cor. xiii, 12; and in column four, Geikie's *Hours with the Bible*, vol. i, page 51. If, after the student had made two hundred and seventeen entries, he should be reading some passage in a book that again illustrated 1 Cor. xiii, 12, he would simply turn to his *Bible Index*, without making note in his study Bible, and write in the second column the number 218 opposite the second entry. Then opposite this number 218 in the first column he would write 1 Cor. xiii, 12, and the name of the book he was reading, with the page. Every time he wished to comment upon that passage of Scripture he would find the two references, and any others he might add thereto. To illustrate the method of using the book I transcribe a few lines from my copy of the *Index*, as follows:

Number opposite text in marg. Bible.	Next reference, same text.	Text.	Book reference.
7	36	Matt. iv, 1.	<i>Ecce Homo</i> , chap. ii.
12		Exod. xx, 14.	Butler's <i>Bible Work</i> (Exod.—Deut.), p. 190.
26		Exod. xx, 14.	<i>Hom. Rev.</i> , vol. x, p. 273.
41		Rom. i, 16.	<i>Sc. Book A</i> , p. 13—(1.)
48		Rom. iii, 26.	Raymond's <i>Theol.</i> , vol. i, p. 23, etc.

I doubt if any *index rerum* yet arranged will afford the advantages offered in this little book; and, as it is already prepared and costs but seventy-five cents, it will pay any minister to give it a trial. If I do not receive letters of thanks for this suggestion I shall be surprised, as some ministers of distinction have said it is one of the most valuable books any friend ever brought to their attention. With this device and a *Foster's Index*, either the busiest or the most careless minister ought to be able to hold the more valuable facts and suggestions of his daily readings.

Reading, Pa.

F. B. LYNCH.

FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

PROFESSOR DR. F. H. HESSE, OF GIESSEN.

It is truly astonishing how few German theologians hold to the Pauline authorship of the pastoral epistles. Among those who concede their post-Pauline origin is Hesse. Nevertheless he is not so extreme as to deny all traces of Pauline authorship and influence. On the other hand, he holds that fragments of these interesting letters, at least, are from the hand of Paul. He furthermore holds that these letters contain information concerning the life of Paul subsequent to the point at which the Acts of the Apostles ends, and that this information is far more trustworthy than any which we can find in the traditions of the Church. These letters are, therefore, to him not the product of forgery. They reflect different periods in the history of the Church and have reference to the needs of bishops of different localities. They are a compilation of instructions given at various times in reference to the rights and duties of officers of the Church. Therefore we dare not think of them as the product of one pen, although, on the whole, they are the product of one spirit and have the same historical background. Nor is each of these letters written by a distinct author. The history of the origin of each is the history of all. They were probably all put into their present shape by one author; but several hands worked over the original document before it reached its present form, about the middle of the second century. This, in general, is the favorite view of to-day. There is a reaction against the extreme view that they were written for the purpose of subjugating obstinate opposers of ecclesiastical authority, and that, to give them greater effect, they were ascribed to Paul, though he had no hand in them and they did not reflect his principles. As the tendency to-day is to admit the Johannean spirit in John, while denying his authorship, so the Pauline spirit is seen in these letters, though they were not wholly written by his hand. The supposition that to the Pauline portions were added the directions concerning ecclesiastical officers helps us out of an historical difficulty, since these letters, if wholly Pauline, presuppose a much earlier development of the officary of the Church than we have otherwise reason to find. To those who do not believe in a divinely ordained principle of church government the supposition of the late origin of these directions holds nothing very repulsive.

DR. ERNST HÜCKSTÄDT.

OCCASIONALLY an overburdened German pastor finds time to make his influence felt outside the bounds of his own parish. Such is the case with Dr. Hückstädt, whose studies in the history of doctrine are of great value. A brief statement of his treatment of the Book of *Hermas* the Shepherd will illustrate his method of historical research and show the significance of such studies. He begins by fixing the date, the authorship, and the

object of the book. He then proceeds to educe the doctrines it contains: 1. Concerning the revelation of God in creation; 2. Concerning the revelation of God in the sacred history. It is under the second point that he commits the offense of reading into the book what he believes and out of it what he does not believe. He holds that the author was a member of the Church catholic, and that his book is a presentation of the doctrines in vogue about A. D. 140. As it was written at that period of the Church's history he supposes the teachings to be comparatively true to those of the apostles. Now he finds, with regard to Christ, no reference to the supernatural conception, no representation of Jesus as the Son of God, no support for the idea that Jesus was more than a sinless man, no teaching concerning the doctrine of original sin; while he makes the pre-existent Son of God identical with the Holy Spirit. The death of Christ had no special significance. It was a part of his work, as that which preceded and that which has since followed. It seems a pity for an author so well qualified by natural endowments and cultivation as Hückstädt to allow his own subjectivity to so completely master him. One is impressed throughout that his conclusions are foregone, and that all he does is to so interpret the language as to make them support his opinions. He strenuously opposes Zahn, confessedly the greatest expositor of Hermas, unless we may except Harnack; and he opposes him chiefly along those lines which affect evangelical doctrine. His course vitiates confidence in all his conclusions, even on points where no special doctrinal significance is recognized. It is difficult, indeed, to eliminate wholly the subjective element from our judgments, and there are few who succeed in the attempt. But in the case of Hückstädt the subjective is plainly the predominant element.

DR. HEINRICH BÖTTGER.

This man, who was a librarian, waited until he was eighty years old before he took up the cudgel against the dogmaticians. He is appalled at the divergent beliefs which are held in the body of Christ, and believes that only an appeal to primitive Christianity can settle the questions in dispute. He maintains that early Christianity was practically free from dogma, and that the faith of the Church was mainly centered about miraculous manifestations; that is, the supernatural elements of Christianity were those which held the attention of the followers of Christ. That the attempt to systematize theology and state the fundamental facts of the Christian religion in exact words has led to wide divisions among Christians is unquestionable. The Christianity of revelation pertained to life. There were many gaps in the system, but none which affected conduct. It is only when men begin to philosophize upon Christianity as a system that differences of opinion begin to arise. When religion becomes a theory, as well as a practice, all manner of speculations may be expected to arise. It is the bane of Christendom to-day that we are striving after a science of religion. The leaders of religious thought are investigating the Christian system with all the power of their intellects; they might better

spend their energies in trying to further the practical interests of Christ's kingdom. It is the peculiar merit of the Ritschl school in Germany that they insist upon making Christianity a practical concern; their mistake is in not consistently carrying out their own fundamental position. John Wesley was wiser in his day. He, too, believed that Christianity was nothing more than a practical concern of life. There were many dogmas which he firmly held and many which he denied; but to the utmost of his ability he avoided antagonism with others, and maintained the importance of the practical side of religion. Germany has been riven with controversies until the life has been taken out of her faith. America is raising up a class of theologians whose tendencies are in the same direction. The danger from them is not in any views they may hold of the inspiration or inerrancy of the Bible, but lest they lead devout minds to shift the center of gravity from the heart to the head. They have no thought of this kind, but there is danger of that very result.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

THE PROPHECIES OF THE CAPTIVITY, BY R. T. HEREFORD.

THIS book is mentioned here, not because it is of any special importance or because it adds anything to our stock of theological knowledge, but because it is a convenient handbook in which to find in English a popular presentation of the latest conclusions of criticism concerning the latter part of Isaiah. The author does not positively deny that Isaiah wrote the last twenty-seven chapters. He claims, however, that their subject, manner, and style are so distinct as to warrant their treatment as an independent work. The book is one of the series of biblical manuals published by the Sunday School Association of London. The commentary is based upon the English of the Revised Version. The introduction is treated under five heads: a general sketch of the historical groundwork of the prophecies; a sketch of their form and contents; an account of the theology of the prophet, so far as it is characteristic of him; a special notice of his doctrine of the "servant of Jehovah;" an account of the evidence bearing upon the date and authorship of the prophecies. After reading the book one is filled with wonder that a Sunday school association should think it worth while to publish it. The purpose of a Sunday school association, as we understand it here in America, is to furnish literature which tends directly to spiritual edification, not to trouble itself with questions of higher criticism. Yet here is a book which tacitly assumes the correctness of higher critical principles and spreads the results before the minds of the young. The wonder ceases, however, when we read on past the last comment and into the list of advertised books for the Sunday school and home published by the Sunday School Association, and see the prominence given to the Unitarian faith. Although many Trinitarians believe with regard to the last chapters of Isaiah as does this Unitarian, yet would they hardly think it a suitable thing to teach their views to a Sunday school class. These critical opinions are not

settled in the minds of most critical scholars. They are held as opinions, not as dogmas. They have not yet reached the stage where they may with safety be made the property of the adult layman, much less of youth. But the dogmatic negativeness of the Unitarians loves just such food. They believe, not as scholars, but as partisans. Nevertheless, we still recommend this little manual, not to children and youth, but to more mature Christians who wish to know the modern teaching concerning Isaiah.

"THE SERVANT OF THE LORD" IN ISAIAH XL-LXVI, BY JOHN FORBES, D.D., LL.D.

As a companion to the book just mentioned this should be used. It is written with a full knowledge of the arguments against the Isaiahan authorship and of the fact that nearly all European scholars admit that Isaiah did not write it, and yet it maintains him as the author. He gives five principal reasons for holding to the traditional view. 1. The reference in the decree of Cyrus (Ezra i, 1, 2) to the supremacy of Jehovah is copied from Isaiah xlv, 27, 28; xlv, 1, 13. Professor Forbes thinks so worldly-wise a man as Cyrus would not have issued such a decree without the most convincing evidence of the genuineness and antiquity of the prophecy of Isaiah. 2. He thinks the language, "I am the Lord which called them by name;" "I have called thee by name;" "I have surnamed thee," referring to Cyrus, could have been justified only by its utterance long before the birth of Cyrus. The emphasis it gives to the fact that he is called by name would be ridiculous if written at the close of the Babylonian exile. 3. "The fondness of the writer for paronomasia, or allusion to the symbolical import of names, speaks strongly for his identification with the proto-Isaiah who arranged his first great prophecy so as to bring out successively the import of the names of his sons and himself. . . . A later writer . . . would have most carefully avoided such apparent identification of himself with his predecessor." Besides, the writer of second Isaiah has identified his age with that of Hezekiah (chap. xxxviii, 5-22) and his queen Hephzibah (chap. lxii, 4, 5). 4. He affirms that the prophecy of chapters xl-lxvi forms part of the whole Book of Isaiah. Chapters xxxviii, xxxix, narrate Hezekiah's sickness and the message of the Lord to him—"All that is in thine house . . . shall be carried to Babylon. . . . And thy sons . . . shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon," thus preparing the people for his prophetic description of the Babylonian period. 5. The fact that chapter xl does not begin with a formula such as "The word of the Lord came," as distinct prophecies usually do, shows that it is a continuation of what had already been begun. Some of these arguments directly contravene the positions taken by the supporters of the deutero-Isaiahan theory. For example, in opposition to 3 it is usually held that the second Isaiah identifies his age with that of the Babylonian exile, whereas the second Isaiah made his age that of Assyria. Also, in opposition to 4 it is held that the first Isaiah never announces the Babylonian captivity, and hence could not speak as the writer of chapters xl-lxvi does. The book is a true specimen of higher criticism on the traditional side.

THE LIVES AND TIMES OF THE MINOR PROPHETS, BY REV.
F. W. FARRAR, D.D.

WE do not mention this book for its originality nor for its recent publication, but for much the same reasons which have prompted the mention of the two preceding, namely, that it is an accessible source of critical information on the topic of which it treats. In fact, the book, one of the *Men of the Bible* series, gives us a tolerably full critical discussion in popular form of the whole question of prophecy. Farrar follows Kuenen's division of the prophets into five groups: 1. B. C. 900-850. The Pre-Assyrian period—Amos, Hosea, Joel (?); 2. B. C. 850-700. The Assyrian period—Micah, Isaiah; 3. B. C. 626-586. The Chaldean period—Nahum, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, the elder Zechariah, Obadiah; 4. B. C. 586-536. The exile—Ezekiel; 5. B. C. 520-400. The postexilic prophets—Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi. It will be noticed that he does not include in this list either Jonah or Daniel. The former only comes legitimately under his notice. He, with most other recent authors, denies it the character of prophecy, calling it rather "the history of a prophecy." It is a moral allegory, not actual history. He favors the view that it was written subsequent to the exile, possibly as late as the Maccabean age. Farrar is not of those who doubt the historicity of Jonah on account of its miracles. His position is that of many other evangelical critics, that there is no reason for taking these statements as literal facts. Its moral and religious lessons are equally valid if it be taken as allegory. He believes also in a threefold Zechariah. The division he makes is the usual one—chapters i-viii; ix-xi; xii-xiv. In order to understand this division it must be remembered that the true Zechariah (i-viii) was a postexilic prophet. The anonymous author of chapters ix-xi he places in the northern kingdom about the time of the first Isaiah. The third portion was also written by an unknown prophet, who lived, probably, about the time of Jeremiah. This method of treatment will illustrate the critical view that the name placed at the head of a book does not necessarily apply to all the prophecies which lie between that and the next name. Farrar thinks it impossible to maintain the unity of Zechariah, and regards the assignment of the three books to one author as a mistake arising from forgetfulness of the real author and some slight similarity between the three parts.

THE HIGHER CRITICS AND THE PROPHETS.

EXCEPTING the Pentateuch, no part of the Old Testament receives at the present time so much attention from the higher critics as the books of the prophets. The importance of these books to the various critical theories is inestimable. Generally speaking, the traditional view of the authorship and date of the prophecies is not questioned. The latter part of Isaiah, the books of Daniel and Jonah, and Zechariah ix-xiv are placed at different dates from those generally accepted; but the remainder are conceded to be the work of the prophets to whom they are ascribed. As a consequence, whatever they say is scrutinized with the most minute care, to determine what they knew or did not know of the history of

Israel declared in the earlier books of the Bible to have occurred prior to or during their lifetime. It is one of the strongest evidences to the critics of the late origin of the Pentateuch, that the prophets seem not to have known of many of the provisions which it contains, but on the contrary denounced the very things the Pentateuch commands. This, it is supposed, they would not have done had these commandments been known to be in existence and derived from Moses himself. The prophets thus become in a measure to the Old Testament what the four principal letters of Paul have been to the New Testament. They are the criterion by which the rest is judged. One of the consequences of this is a large number of published works on the prophecies and the prophets. In the nature of the case these critics must take their stand concerning prophecy. Until they are sure of their ground here they can make no progress. This is as true of the New Testament critics as of the Old, but for a different reason. Much of the New Testament professes to be the record of the fulfillment of prophecy. But if it be such its supernatural character is at once assured. Hence there is of necessity a feverish anxiety on the part of traditionalist, conservative, and radical to ascertain the facts as to fulfillment or nonfulfillment. If the professed fulfillments recorded in the New Testament are unreal, then the connection between the events in the New and the prophecies in the Old is destroyed; our faith in the supernatural character of Christianity, and also in the inspiration of the prophets, is somewhat shaken. On the other hand, it must also be settled whether the apparent fulfillments are mere coincidences or whether the mind which inspired the prophecies also directed the history, so that all came to pass as predicted. Were the prophets deceivers, or were they sincere? If the latter, what proof have we that they were truly sent of God? The great difficulty in believing in the true inspiration of the prophets lies in the other difficulty of finding an agreement between their predictions and their fulfillment. This divergence is admitted by most cautious conservatives; but it is explained in a different way from that employed by the radicals. Both classes undertake to explain the phenomena from the nature and purpose of prediction. But the radicals simply place Hebrew prophecy on a par with similar manifestations in heathendom, while the conservatives maintain the true divine mission of the prophets. The explanation they give of the partial nonfulfillment of the predictions of the Old Testament prophets is that these predictions are conditional. In Jeremiah xviii, 7-10, God declares it as one of the principles of his government that he will carry out his threatenings or recall them, according as his people subsequently conduct themselves; and so also of his promises. And God is moved to make his promises and threatenings conditional by the fact that man, with whom God has to deal, is a changeable being, and also by the fact that he will not cut himself off from the privilege of exercising mercy. It is the failure of the radical student of prophecy to recognize this conditionality of the prophecies which has caused them so often to declare the prophets either deceivers or deceived. A further explanation is given in the fact that many of the prophecies were put in the form of a promise

of temporal good, subsequently realized in spiritual blessing. Yet it was necessary to predict in the earthly form, because God foresaw that Israel would make the fulfillment slow by their sins, and because promise in the earthly form alone would have the effect of controlling their conduct. Thus taken literally many prophecies never came to pass; and yet they were realized in a higher form, made possible by the gradual development of a higher religious state. Whatever weight we may give to these explanations, they show conclusively that it is not necessary to suppose that the prophets were, on the one hand, deceivers nor, on the other, deceived. They spoke the truth. Their predictions found fulfillment according to the possibilities prepared by man himself.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

PRUSSIAN ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS.

THE report of the Church authorities in Berlin of the work of the evangelical Church for 1891 has recently been published. It contains the following interesting statistics: Of the 562,961 children born during 1891 there were baptized 533,244; out of every 100 marriages 91 were solemnized by ministers. These figures are supposed to indicate an unexpected loyalty to the ordinances of the Church, neglect of baptism and civil, instead of ecclesiastical, marriages having heretofore been on the increase. Of those adults who became adherents of the evangelical Church 289 were Jews, 2,478 Roman Catholics, 478 from other communions. Of those who forsook the evangelical Church 6 became Jews, 204 Roman Catholics, and 2,679 entered other communions. These figures also are encouraging, take them as you will. For the number of Jews and Romanists who became evangelicals is large in proportion to the number of those evangelicals who became Jews or Romanists. The 2,679 evangelicals who entered other communions went mostly to Methodist, Baptist, and other similar organizations. But the number of divorce processes increased frightfully, the whole number being 12,026, while there were actually 4,273 divorces granted. The whole number of new churches dedicated was 59.

THE READMISSION OF THE JESUITS TO GERMANY.

On the 20th of February a meeting of those who are opposed to the return of the Jesuits was held in Barmen. About 1,500 persons were present from Prussia, Würtemberg, Thuringia, and Bremen, the meeting having been called by about 480 evangelicals from every part of Germany. Professor Dr. Achelis, of Marburg, spoke on "The Morals of the Jesuits;" Professor Dr. Rietschel, of Leipsic, on "The Order of Jesuits and Our Civil Life;" and Court-preacher Rogge, of Berlin, on the political side of the question. The strong utterances of the meeting against the readmission of the Jesuits were sent by telegraph to the imperial chancellor. At the same time another meeting was held in Ludwigshafen which adopted similar resolutions. A petition has been sent to the Reichstag

from the committee in Barmen signed by 68,798 persons. Another gathered by the pastors of 39 different parishes has been sent, and it reaches the proportions of 84,655 signers. Petitions have also been sent from almost all officaries of the congregations in the district of Wiesbaden. From Leipsic a petition was sent signed by 15,604 persons. Even Roman Catholics in many cases sign these petitions. It hardly seems possible that in the face of all this opposition the Jesuit laws will be repealed.

MISSION WORK IN UGANDA.

A RECORD of the many difficulties through which missionaries in Uganda have fought their way cannot here be given. But at latest advices prosperity seems to have come with some promise of permanence. The country is divided among the Protestants, Romanists, and Mohammedans. The heathen population is not, however, by any means extinct. The king is nominally Protestant and is receiving evangelical instruction, sometimes attending divine service. His pages and servants are being taught to read, and the women of his court are being instructed in the biblical history and the principles of the Gospel. Already over 300 persons have been baptized, among whom are 100 communicants; and besides these over 2,000 are receiving instruction preparatory to baptism. A new and commodious church, capable of accommodating at least 2,500, is nearly complete. The land is at peace. The one condition of success for Protestantism now seems to be that the English should maintain their hold upon the government. The natives of Uganda are very bright, not only learning with great facility, but also displaying remarkable aptitude as teachers. The dark continent will yet be penetrated with the true Light.

CHANGES OF FAITH IN SAXONY.

THE number of those who left the National Church during 1891 was 502, while those who entered it were 205. The number of proselytes to the Roman Catholic Church was 23, the number who forsook Romanism to enter the Saxon National Church was 115. The Dissenters received from the National Church 133, and 15 Dissenters returned to the National Church. The Irvingites received from the National Church 102, and gave it 6; the Baptists 95, and gave it 4; the Methodists 86, and gave back 4; the Separatist Lutherans 74, and gave back 5; the German Catholics 20, of whom 18 returned. From Judaism 36 persons entered the Saxon Church, while of the latter 1 became a Jew. The number lost from Romanism to Protestantism was five times as great as the number lost from Protestantism to Romanism. But it will be noticed that the National Church suffered a net loss of 337. The number of Roman Catholics who became Methodists or Baptists is not given in our sources of information; but the number of the converts of these two American denominations here given, being those only coming from the National Church, does not at all indicate their total gains. It is interesting to note that the people of Germany are thinking about their faith, and are not blindly following in the traditions of their fathers.

EDITORIAL REVIEWS.

SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

MEN will never have done writing of the Jew. Because of his religious prominence he stands as a perpetual study. With his physical, social, and commercial peculiarities he is a marked character in modern civilization. In his serious views of life, resulting from his ethical training, and with centuries of persecution, exile, and hardship as an indelible part of his racial history; he is one of the most tragic actors upon the stage of human performance rather than a delineator of lightsome comedy. Taking it all in all, no figure is more fascinating than that of the Israelite, and none is more sure of a large place in future literature.

The perpetual interest that centers around him has its latest expression in various articles found in recent numbers of several important *Reviews*, prominent among these being a paper on "The Development of New Testament Judaism" in the April number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. "Of all the peoples of Western Asia," argues the author, Professor Schodde, "only the Jews were able to resist the disintegrating process which set in with the conquest of the Orient by Alexander the Great, and to which the individuality and nationality of the others fell an easy prey." Differentiating the Jews in this manner from other contemporaneous nations, the professor finds in this resistance the "operation of factors in the historical development of Israel which were absent in the life of other peoples." These factors were "the religious convictions and ideals of the people." But in the New Testament days the Pharisees as a class particularly "represented the controlling religious thought of the times." In three respects, according to the writer, did their teachings differ from those of Christ: (1) as to their carnal conception of the kingdom of God upon the earth; (2) in the substitution of the nomistic principle for the principle of faith; (3) and as regards the person of the Messiah. If this be the character of New Testament Judaism the inquiry into the forces which were operative in the development of post-exilic Israel becomes an important one. In the judgment of Professor Schodde the commencement of New Testament Judaism reaches back to the times of Ezra. "The beginning of an erroristic development," he remarks, "was introduced into Israel's religion when, through Ezra's and Nehemiah's activity, the law became the sole controlling religious factor to the almost total exclusion of the prophetic element." From which period the continual existence and operation of legalism may be traced, being rebuked by Malachi, encouraged by the Maccabean wars, and fostered by the undermining influence of Hellenistic culture in the East.

Somewhat connected with the foregoing article, so far as its discussion of the Messiahship is concerned, is a paper in the *Biblical World* for June

on "The Teachings of Jesus and the Teachings of the Jews in the Time of Christ Respecting the Messiah and His Kingdom." Professor Scott, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, is the writer. By his showing Jesus taught not only "a new conception of the character of God" and "a new view of man and the world," but also a notion of the Messiahship that was in striking divergence from the beliefs of Judaism. "Rabbinical theology," the professor states, "taught no God-man. The scribes expected that Messiah would be born as other men. He would not be sinless. In adult life he would become the Messiah. He would probably die like other men." Such a view of the Messiahship is so different from the teachings of Jesus thereupon that its very mention is sufficient. The Jewish views regarding the Messiah, moreover, were "diverse, fragmentary, and conflicting;" while the Lord "first presented and taught a consistent, personal, whole Messiah." Jesus also "appeared as prophet, priest, and king"—a combination "unknown to the Jewish conception of the Messiah." Furthermore, the Jews, in their theology, held no doctrine of a suffering Messiah who should make atonement for men by his pains and death. And, finally, as regards the Messianic kingdom, its nature, and coming, the teaching of Jesus was in striking opposition to the views of Judaism.

In the *Contemporary Review* for May appears a vigorous article upon a phase of the Jewish question, entitled "The Antisemitic Movement." When the first Napoleon predicted that in fifty years Europe would be either Cossack or Republican it is well said that he "reckoned without the Jew." Upon the Continent the latter is a ruling factor. On the Seine, the Spree, the Danube, he dominates the press. Many of the great international telegraphic news companies are his property. He is ruler of the produce and money markets and the purveyor of popular amusements. The "consulship of the great and lesser powers is almost entirely" in his hands. In short, with a minutiae of delineation which only a consultation of the article itself may make plain is there set forth the extraordinary influence of the Jew upon the Continent. But persecution, as well as prosperity, is still his lot. In Russia, in Roumania, in Austria, in France, and elsewhere the hostility of the ages is repeating itself against those whom Herr Stöcker calls the "scum of the earth." Yet this Antisemitism is to be explained on other grounds besides envy of Jewish success. There is in addition "a spirit of restlessness abroad—a feeling that something is wrong and must be put right." The revolt is against the materialistic tendencies of the age. There must be "a rebirth of individual character." The protest is against the Jews only as they are the most prosperous representatives of that which "foreshadows the decadence of character" in national life.

THE *Nineteenth Century* for June opens with a scholarly article by James Martineau on "The Gospel of Peter." Brief as this fragmentary document is, Mr. Martineau finds in it most interesting variations from the story of the crucifixion as written in the accepted gospels; discovers therein Docetic

doctrines which set the reader down in the midst of a *Gentilized* Christianity; and traces in it some "useful marks of time" which point to A. D. 130 as the approximate date of its appearance. The second article, by C. de Polignac, discusses "Ulster and the Confederate States." Under the caption of "Six Hundred Years of English Poverty" Gustav F. Steffen has prepared an exhaustive study of "the fluctuations of the purchasing power of wages," with all that the phrase signifies. An elaborate chart in colors adds to the value of the article. The next paper, by W. Roberts, is entitled "Rare Books and their Prices." Only some expert like this editor of the *Bookworm* has new light to throw upon this subject. R. F. Murray writes "An Impossible Correspondence—1892;" Mrs. Caroline Creyke, of "The Rothamsted Experiments" as applied to vegetation and animals; and Charles L. Eastlake, "The Poldi-Pezzoli Collection at Milan." An article by J. Henniker Heaton, on "Post Office 'Plundering and Blundering,'" calls for some needed reforms in English practice. The unsatisfactory results of the Habitual Drunkards' Act, after fourteen years' experience, are set forth by John Batty Tuke in a paper entitled "Habitual Drunkards." A. P. Sinnett thoughtfully replies to Professor Max Müller, in "Esoteric Buddhism;" Lord Vernon discusses "How to Attract Capital to the Land;" and P. L. Selater, in "A Naturalist's View of the Fur-Seal Question," contends that "pelagic sealing" should end. "The Craving for Fiction," by Herbert Maxwell, is a timely advisory article. The closing paper, on "Protection and the Empire," by Walter Frewen Lord, calls for unity of free trade action among "Englishmen the world over" as necessary to national perpetuation.

THE *North American Review* for June is an interesting number. It opens with an important paper on "The Lesson of the Naval Review," by the Hon. Hilary A. Herbert, Secretary of the Navy. That prolific writer, W. H. Mallock, presents an article in answer to the question, "Who Are the Greatest Wealth Producers?" He denies that the wealth of our modern world is created chiefly by manual labor, and insists that by far the larger share of it may be distinctly traced to the part taken in industrial activity by the brains of the few who have the ability for invention and management. Surrogate Ransom, of New York, attempts to show "How to Check Testamentary Litigation." The son of Charles Dickens writes on "Disappearing Dickensland." There are two articles of only passing interest on "Police Protection at the World's Fair." Andrew Carnegie contributes a paper entitled "A Look Ahead," in which he predicts a reunion of England and America in a general federation of the English-speaking world preliminary to the parliament of man. Professor Biles, of Glasgow University, who designed the great ocean steamers *Paris* and *New York*, writes that "thirty knots an hour to Europe" is a possibility already within clear sight, making it appear that, in the opinion of a skilled expert in practical nautical engineering, ships may be built to cross the Atlantic in four days. This seems a remarkable rate of speed. The Rev. Dr. Rainsford, of St. George's Episcopal Church, New

York city, is a man of energy and expedients, who directs a large variety of religious services and humane efforts; but his article on "The Possible Reformation of the Drink Traffic," in the May issue of this same publication, and his replies to his critics in the June number present a grotesque and impossible scheme for any Christian Church to undertake.

THE *Fortnightly Review* for June contains: 1. "The Bank Panic in Australia;" 2. "The Currency Crisis in the United States;" 3. "The Two Salons;" 4. "Drink and Crime;" 5. "African Legends;" 6. "Le Secret du Précepteur;" 7. "The Unification of the City;" 8. "The Poor Children's Holiday;" 9. "The Interstellar Ether;" 10. "The Comédie-Française in London;" 11. "In Memory of John Addington Symonds;" 12. "The Royal Academy;" 13. "The Empire and its Institute." It is difficult in so much that is good to specify what is best. The first two articles are pertinent notices of the prevalent and perplexing stringency in the financial world. Archdeacon Farrar is the writer of "Drink and Crime" and shows the intimate connection between the two, in reply to Mr. Walker's previous assertion of their nonrelation. Henry M. Stanley, in "African Legends," records various curious and weird narratives told him by his "trusty dark companions round the evening camp-fire." In the interests of the London child toilers Lady Jeune contends for an increased holiday recreation. In his article on "The Royal Academy" D. S. MacColl assaults its uncatholic spirit, its low standards, and its preference for the new "in a cheapened form."

THE *New World* for June opens with a paper by Hermann Schultz on "Modern Explanations of Religion," which is a careful consideration of some of the theories of its origin. The trend of the paper by C. Lloyd Morgan is sufficiently clear from its title, "Evolution: A Restatement." In a study of "Tennyson and Browning as Spiritual Forces" C. C. Everett finds that the former "represents the realistic and human aspect of ethics and religion," while the latter "represents rather their ideal aspect." But "each had his special work and each performed it nobly." Elisé Bost instructively discusses "The Social Movement in French Protestantism;" George Batchelor ably notices "The Triple Standard in Ethics," such standards being external authority, social utility, and the personal ideal; and John P. Peters, in "The Development of the Psalter," antagonizes some of the "critical methods" of Professor Cheyne's Bampton Lectures of 1889. The article of Joseph H. Crooker on "The Congregational Polity" is clear and valuable; while the concluding paper on "Andrew Preston Peabody," by Philip Stafford Moxon, is a most admirable biographical sketch of one of the leaders of later Unitarianism.

THE *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ* has: 1. "The Roman Catholic Church and the Public Schools;" 2. "Tendencies Threatening Bible Authority;" 3. "Christianity and Social Evolution;" 4. "A

Century of Sabbath School Work in the United Brethren Church;" 5. "Depravity." The first article, by L. F. John, vigorously contends for the principle of Church *and* State as "essential to civil and religious liberty." In the second paper, J. P. E. Kumler notices as three forces which assault Bible authority: (1) a "growing belief in the law of natural progress;" (2) the exaltation of "the religious consciousness to a level with, and even above, the revealed word of God;" (3) higher criticism. The third paper, by W. C. Day, shows the parallel growth of Christianity and of society, with the dependence of the latter upon the former. The fourth article, by Robert Cowden, presents statistics of denominational growth which redound to the credit of the United Brethren. The final paper, by W. S. Reese, is a thoughtful discussion of Article VIII of the Confession of Faith held by the United Brethren. In addition to these articles a curious and attractive paper is found in the editorial department on "A Census of the Population of Heaven."

THE *American Catholic Quarterly Review* for April is a weighty number and contains the following: 1. "The Age of the Human Race According to Modern Science and Biblical Chronology;" 2. "The High Church Position Untenable;" 3. "Latin Hymns and English Versions;" 4. "English Liberty from the Reformation to the Triumph of the Prince of Orange;" 5. "The Lately Recovered Apocryphal Gospel According to Peter;" 6. "The Late Archbishop Ullathorne;" 7. "Notes to Show the Necessity of True Religion for Rational Men;" 8. "Catholic Tendency in American Literature;" 9. "Madagascar and Catholic Missions;" 10. "More Light on the Election of Urban VI;" 11. "Scientific Chronicle." The first article devotes twenty-four pages to showing that astronomy, history, and linguistics require a greater antiquity for mankind than biblical scholars have been accustomed to concede; but the discussion of the most important part of the thesis goes over to a future article. The next article is based upon William Francis Brand's life of the late Bishop Whittingham, of the diocese of Maryland, who is characterized as the most remarkable personage, except John Henry Hobart, that has figured among the leaders of the High Church party in the Protestant Episcopal Church; and it shows with great force that the reasoning by which the Anglo-Catholics, Ritualists, or High Churchmen, as they are variously called, justify themselves in the position they take ought, by an *a fortiori* logic, to carry them one step farther into the open arms of Rome, "the mother and mistress of Churches." This is an argument hard to dispose of, and some of the strongest men have yielded to it. The fourth article reads history through Romish spectacles, and is unfair to persons and untrue to facts as they appear to Protestant and to neutral eyes. The seventh paper was left at his decease by Adrian Worthington Smith, a brilliant young Catholic layman. Its tone is elevated and its contents are of the richest and noblest; but the article is, after all, a piece of sophistical special pleading to prove the falsehood of all teaching contrary to Roman Catholic dogma. In the eighth article George Parsons

Lathrop, with the ardor of a new convert and the studied skill of an accomplished *littérateur*, tries to show what Romanism has done for literature in this country, and how American writers, from Anne Bradstreet, wife of an early New England governor, down to Hawthorne, Lowell, and Longfellow, have been indebted to the influence of Catholic culture, art, and worship. Mr. Lathrop fails to make out a strong case. The result is feeble and flimsy.

THE *Contemporary Review* for June has the following list of articles: 1. "Ulster: Facts and Figures;" 2. "Some Eton Translations" (made by Mr. Gladstone when eighteen years old); 3. "The Eight-Hours Day and the Unemployed;" 4. "The Church in Wales;" 5. "In the Poet's Garden;" 6. "King John and the Abbot of Bury;" 7. "The Primitive Gospel;" 8. "A Conscript's View of the French Army;" 9. "The Prospects of the Civilized World;" 10. "The Pope and Father Brandi: A Reply." The most interesting and valuable things in this array of contents are the fifth, seventh, and ninth papers. The fifth, by Phil Robinson, is a delightful ramble through poetry to find the flowers which the poets have culled and preserved in their pages. In the seventh E. J. Dillon discusses the character of the sources from which the four gospels were derived—the observed actions and reported sayings of our Lord which may be said to constitute "the Primitive Gospel," made of various written narratives and trustworthy oral traditions. The ninth article is a wide survey, by J. Llewelyn Davies, of the present condition, observed tendencies, and probable future of mankind. On the whole it is far from cheerful. We decline to believe in so gloomy and darkening a prospect. Humanity refuses to be discouraged and labors hopefully for a better morrow.

THE *Yale Review* for May first comments on "The Gold Reserve and Bond Issues," "The Farmers' Movement in Connecticut," and "Trade Unions and the Law." The second of these comments sets forth the hostile legislation of Connecticut against the Sheffield School of Yale University, through which funds granted by the national government to the State for providing instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts have been taken away from Yale, in violation of a long-continued contract with the university and greatly crippling the work of its scientific school. The claim is here made that this farmers' legislation in Connecticut is only a branch of the National Granger movement, and is in effect a nullifying of an act of Congress. The third item of "comment" notes two tendencies of law evinced in recent judicial decisions relative to the responsibility of trade unions, namely, to recognize labor organizations as bodies which in themselves are legal and which have a standing in court, and to apply to such organizations the same responsibility with regard to the public that has been applied to corporations. The contributed articles which follow treat on, 1. "Individualism as a Sociological Principle;" 2. "The Republic of Andorre;" 3. "The Unrest of English Farmers;" 4. "An Athenian Parallel to a Function of Our Supreme Court;"

5. "The Natural History of Party." In the first of these articles President Andrews, of Brown University, writes along the line of his specialty, and asserts that automatism in the economic domain is not sufficient. Things will not go right of themselves or by any natural law. The functions of government are not confined to police work; it should also make itself a regulating and harmonizing factor in the economic sphere. The second article is a most interesting account of a little republic hid from all Europe for a thousand years in a valley among the Pyrenees, a curiously surviving fragment of mediæval Europe, not essentially modified, even now, by the civilization of to-day. The third article aims at explaining in part the present agricultural discontent in England. The last contributed paper divides the life-history of any great political party into (1) the origin of parties; (2) the party before its advent to power; (3) the party in power; (4) in opposition; (5) in dissolution. Among signs that betoken the dissolution of a party are enumerated the following: 1. Inability to provide for a new and dominant want of the State; 2. The appearance of faction, though this phenomenon does not necessarily portend party decay; 3. Pessimism and the dominance of senile elements.

THE *Catholic World* for June contains several noticeable articles. One of these, by Augustine F. Hewit, is on "The Human Soul of Jesus Christ." The "distinct, perfect human nature of Jesus Christ," remarks the author, "has already been shown to be an article of Catholic faith. His human soul is the principal and superior part of this composite nature. It was the soul which gave winning and commanding power to the glance of his eye, beauty to his face, majesty to his bearing, and was 'sorrowful even unto death.'" "The Latest Phase of the Drink Question," by A. B. O'Neill, is a notice of the Keeley cure, and closes with the suggestion that the Catholic total abstinence societies investigate its claims and, if worthy, give it their "sanction and cooperation." In his article on "What Are We Doing for Non-Catholics?" A. M. Clark writes of the responsibility and the work of the Church. He is the agent in the distribution of "a printed prayer for the conversion of America!" In the concluding article, entitled "Bishop Vincent Not a Good Methodist," we find a rejoinder to the latter's recent paper in the *Forum* on "The Pope in Washington." The gist of the reply is that Bishop Vincent is astray in the interpretation of conscience. We cannot judge the article an instance of superlative polemics.

THE *London Quarterly Review* for April enrolls in its table of contents: 1. "The Great Enigma and its Answer;" 2. "William Cowper;" 3. "The Incarnation in Modern Theology;" 4. "Bernard of Clairvaux;" 5. "Some Socialist Leaders;" 6. "England in Egypt;" 7. "Building Societies;" 8. "The Church of Jerusalem and the Gentile Mission." The first article considers the answer of Christian theism to the question, "What is the meaning of man's life, whence comes he, whither is he going, and Who dwells up above there among the golden stars?" The

second and fourth articles consider, in cursory review, recently issued biographies of two conspicuous characters in Church and in letters. According to the author whose *Manual* is noticed in the third article, the Incarnation is "the center of Christian theology." The socialist leaders noticed in the fifth article include Guesde and Malon, of France; Werner, Bagniski, and Wildberger, of Germany; Von Vollmar, who "belongs to one of the oldest families in Bavaria;" and Morris, Hyndman, and Burns, of England. In the sixth article the right of England to rule in Egypt is shown by her works in that ancient land. Proper restrictions upon building societies form the basis of the seventh paper; while, in the eighth, those who are interested in Judaism will find a review of five volumes recently published upon the apostolic times.

Our Day for June has in part: 1. "President Cleveland's Speech at the Opening of the World's Fair;" 2. "The Duty of Church Members in the Temperance Reform;" 3. "Trusts and Monopolies as Modern Highwaymen;" 4. "Newspaper Apologies for Pugilism;" 5. "The Prophecy of Columbus: A Poem Read at the Opening of the World's Fair." In the second paper Joseph Cook speaks some burning words on the relation of the Church to temperance reform, concluding with the caustic sentence: "It is high time that Americans and, most of all, American Churches should quit fooling with fools." The title of the third article is a sufficient explanation of the demand made therein by W. O. McDowell for greater restrictions upon trusts and monopolies. In addition to the contributed articles the present magazine also contains the second lecture in the Boston Monday series, its title being, "Is the Fourth Commandment Binding upon Christians?" In sturdy and masterly language the lecturer makes an affirmative answer to the inquiry.

THE *Review of Reviews* for June, like all its predecessors, and probably like all its successors, is crowded full of good things. Its sweep is the wide world. To specify its details of discussion is impossible. Whoever reads it reads an encyclopedia of current events.—The *Missionary Review of the World* for July has articles on "The Islands of the Sea" and "Evangelization of the Islands;" "John Eliot, the Apostle of the Red Indians;" "The Japanese Religious Press;" "Indian Missions in the Canadian Northwest;" and "The Present Aspect of Missions in India."—The *Preacher's Magazine* for June contains its usual excellent grouping of sermons, homiletic suggestions, and practical notes.—The *Indian Evangelical Review* for April includes in its contents articles on "Christianity and Some of its Evidences," by Sir Oliver Mowat;" "Social Work Among the Pariahs," by W. Goudie; "Theosophy and Christianity," by David Macewan; "Christian Schoolbooks for Mission Schools," by J. A. MacDonald; "Our World," by A. T. Pierson; "God's Silence and Man's," by S. G. MacLennan.—The *Treasury* for June opens with a sermon by James Demarest. In its various departments the issue is up to its usually excellent standard.

BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE STUDIOUS READER.

WHETHER books shall be a blessing or the opposite—useful, useless, or injurious—is decided by various conditions. A single book has been sufficient to ruin some men. Ill-selected, pernicious, or simply miscellaneous reading is immeasurably demoralizing. The subtlest and most deadly poisons are not in the chemist's flasks, but in literature. The writings of Theodore Parker did little good to any, but assuredly, in proportion to their circulation, much harm to many. It is unsafe as well as unmanly to read with a passive and servile submissiveness of mind. Some men seem to be victimized by authors. One is the lifelong thrall of some dominant thinker; another is at any given time certain to be under the spell of whatever book he may have read last. The habit of critical discrimination toward all that passes before the mind must be cultivated. Mental independence must be defended. Books should stimulate and assist the originating powers to creative action, and not suppress native energies. The excessive reader lacks the fecundity, freshness, and raciness of the free, reflective, and unsundered mind. No mere bookworm ever produced anything that was alive or enlivening. The book which is provocative of thought is more valuable than any invoice of information, however large. "Strive to think well; this is the origin of morality," said Pascal. Thinking makes the man; thinking right goes far to make the good man. One should read, not for the sake of knowing books, but for the sake of thought. To every serious mind reading is a study. Hence the importance of selecting such books as are worth earnest study. Of those noticed in this issue we commend the following: *The Holy Spirit in Missions*, by A. J. Gordon; *Books and Their Use*, by J. H. Thayer; *Christus Consolator*, by Gilbert Haven; *Pagan and Christian Rome*, by Rodolfo Lanciani; *Short History of the Christian Church*, by J. F. Hurst.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The Holy Spirit in Missions. By A. J. GORDON, D.D., Author of *In Christ, The Twofold Life, Ecce Venit*, etc. 12mo, pp. 241. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

This book is made up of six lectures delivered, in 1892, at New Brunswick, N. J., before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, on the Graves Foundation. By the establishment of this course Mr. Nathan F. Graves, of Syracuse, N. Y., provided for the annual presentation of the sublime and momentous theme of foreign missions before theological students. No wiser or more effective way for reinforcing the corps of workers in the mission fields could be devised than to kindle the fire of missionary enthusiasm in the hearts of students in theological schools, universities, colleges, or seminaries. Familiarized with ideal motives of life and standards of conduct, fresh and unspoiled by the sordid

influences of the world, filled with the generous impulses and chivalric readiness, which belong to youth, to do and dare in some brave and self-forgetting fashion, the young people in our halls of learning are the readiest material, as well as the finest and best prepared, for being made into missionaries by scores and hundreds under the call of God, made acquainted with the wide opportunities and urgent demands, and impressed with convictions of duty deep and clear and strong. Such lectures as these before us, delivered in every educational institution of all the Christian denominations, would make those schools recruiting stations from which would come a steady stream of volunteers, the flower of the land and the hope of the world, not only offering to preach the Gospel and enlighten the darkness of heathen lands, but insisting upon going and determined to go, if not in one way then in another. There are more young people, devoted, educated, and knowing what they are about, who are willing and ready to go as missionaries to the ends of the earth than the Church is willing to send. The number will increase until the Church shall be roused out of its torpor and shamed out of its niggardliness. Undeniably the Church lags far behind its duty and its fast-enlarging opportunity; yet it is not good to speak harshly of the Church of the living God. All that is being done is done by and through it. It is the Church that produces all these Christian young people and makes them both fit and ready to go; it is the Church that founds and supports the educational institutions in which they are trained and where the missionary call finds them; it is the Church which rears such ministers as Dr. Gordon to deliver such awakening and inspiring lectures as these; it is the Church that rears such laymen as Mr. Graves, fills them with Christly love for mankind, and moves them to devote their means to the maintenance of such lectureships. Whatever means widely diffuses abroad and conveys to the most appreciative and responsive quarters mission information, correct and full, is directly promotive of missionary zeal and activity. As a general rule missionary zeal is in proportion to knowledge. That any in our churches should be indifferent to the world's evangelization is deplorable; that some who suppose themselves to be Christians should actually express their disbelief in, if not disapproval of, the work of foreign missions is scarcely less than horrible in this closing decade of the great missionary century. What is needed is *information*, INFORMATION, INFORMATION. The preaching of the word brings sinners under conviction. Give knowledge first, enforced and impressed by the Holy Spirit, and then follows conviction. Drench and deluge the Church with information. Ignorance is our curse and our shame. Whoever in this day dares open his lips in opposition to Christian mission work in all lands only advertises himself as an ignoramus, his ignorance being so dense that he actually regards it as substantial wisdom. Probably we are doing this type of Christian too much honor in classing him with ignoramuses. Most likely it would be entirely fair to characterize him as guilty of disingenuous evasion and to consider his disfavor as only a cheap way of dodging his proper share of the financial responsibility.

Dr. Gordon has the spirit of Christ and, therefore, the zeal of missions. He sets forth the great work in six lectures on "The Holy Spirit's Program of Missions," "The Holy Spirit's Preparation in Missions," "The Holy Spirit's Administration in Missions," "The Holy Spirit's Fruits in Missions," "The Holy Spirit's Prophecies Concerning Missions," "The Holy Spirit's Present Help in Missions." To say that this book is worthy of its subject is saying a great deal; yet we are inclined to say it, both on account of its spirit, its scope, and its treatment. And this we say notwithstanding in some minor points his view is not ours, his putting of things being sometimes shaped by doctrines which we cannot accept. In one or two particulars he seems to us to go to extremes, to the weakening of his presentation and to the confusing of things that differ. The things we refer to are such, however, as do not diminish the powerful impression this book makes upon minds which, in some things, hold a somewhat different point of view.

Dr. Gordon's volume has spirituality without sensationalism. It is full of faith, devotion, force, and practical religious good sense. After seeing itself well provided with Bibles and Testaments every Christian family in this year of our Lord, 1893, ought to make sure of having at least one book of this sort on the subject of Christian missions. After the histories contained in the Scriptures which we call sacred there are no human annals, no stories of battles and campaigns, that can match in heroism, patience, self-obliteration, sublime elevation of purpose, and lofty exhibition of the noblest human qualities the great, growing, and glowing history of Christian missions. This modern age in which we live witnesses a world-wide movement which is a renaissance of apostolic days and the prelude of an approaching millennial era. That it seems yet far off is no proof that it is not approaching.

The Book of Joshua. By WILLIAM GORDON BLAICKIE, D.D., LL.D., New College, Edinburgh. 12mo, pp. 416. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The First Book of Kings. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Archdeacon of Westminster. 12mo, pp. 503. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. By WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Church History, New College, London. 12mo, pp. 404. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The Psalms. Vol. I. Psalms I-XXXVIII. By A. MACLAREN, D.D. 12mo, pp. 385. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. II. By the Rev. G. T. STOKES, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock. 12mo, pp. 480. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The Epistle to the Philippians. By ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh. 12mo, pp. 368. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

We have already noticed from time to time many of the volumes included in the "Expositor's Bible" series, have pointed out their more pronounced peculiarities, and have set forth their excellences of exegesis and literary finish. To the many numbers of the series already issued may now be added the six volumes which are above indicated. The first three

treat of important epochs in Old Testament history. Believing that the "naturalistic method" of regarding the Jewish historical books is "a failure," Dr. Blaikie finds in "the supernatural" a sufficient explanation of various strange occurrences. "It was the supernatural element underlying Hebrew history that made it the marvelous development it was; and that element began at the beginning and continued more or less actively till Jesus Christ came in the flesh." In this spirit of reverence for the supernatural the author has ably interpreted the pregnant period of Jewish story covered by the Book of Joshua. Archdeacon Farrar's treatment of the First Book of Kings may be dismissed in a word. It has so much of the clearness and charm of the distinguished author's writings that one reckons it an unusual book. There is not a dull page in the volume. In his discussion of the first thirty-eight Psalms Dr. MacLaren has followed the expository method and, consequently, "found it necessary to leave questions of date and authorship all but untouched." There is in the book much strong meat for sermonizers. In his present volume Dr. Stokes has discussed the latter chapters of the Acts more briefly than the earlier chapters in his previous work. The reason for this he declares to be that the latter chapters "are occupied to a great extent with the work of St. Paul during a comparatively brief period, while the first twenty chapters cover a space of well-nigh thirty years." Feeling that he has nothing new to say on the later narrative of St. Paul's adventures, he acts the part of the wise man in abbreviated notice thereof. Yet his treatment is so full, substantial, and rich that a valuable addition is made to the literature on St. Paul's times. Dr. Rainy's volume on the Philipians keeps company with its fellows in clearness of interpretation. The key to his treatment seems to be found in his observation that "the apostle's teaching repeatedly touches on the question how the problem of practical human life on this earth is to be conceived and dealt with under the light and the influence of Christianity." Messrs. A. C. Armstrong & Son are the publishers of this important series.

Canonical and Uncanonical Gospels. With a Translation of the Recently Discovered Fragments of the Gospel of Peter, and a Selection from the Sayings of Our Lord not found in the Four Gospels. By W. E. BARNES, B.D., Fellow of Peterhouse, and Theological Lecturer at Clare College, Cambridge. 16mo, pp. 112. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Distinction must be made between the canonicity of the gospels and their inspiration. The latter has reference to their supernatural origin and their transmission to the world through chosen agencies; the former to their acceptance by men as the actual word of God. The second relates to the internal spirit of the text; the first, to the attitude of the heart toward the voice which has spoken from on high. And the first problem is none the less imperative of settlement than the second. A conviction of this leads our present author to say of the gospels: "We are not going to try to show that they are the very word of God. . . . The main purpose of this treatise is to sketch the evidence from which we conclude that the four gospels have been accepted from the earliest times as

the authoritative accounts of the life, teaching, and death of the Lord Jesus." Quoting the assumption of the author of *Supernatural Religion* that the earliest period at which the gospels "existed and were of authority in the Church" was A. D. 180, Mr. Barnes proceeds to investigate the time anterior to this date when his antagonist affirms that he found "no trace of any of our four gospels, except the third." Tatian (A. D. 160-180), Justin Martyr (A. D. 150), Hermas (*circ.* A. D. 140-150), and Papias (A. D. 140-150), besides the apostolic fathers, are the several witnesses whom he summons to testify as to the existence of the gospels in their respective times. The first, "a rough mountaineer from beyond the Tigris," in his "Oration to the Greeks" and the famous "Diatessaron," makes quotations from the gospels. The second, in his "Apology," particularly quotes from Matthew and Luke; the third, in "The Shepherd," speaks particularly of the collection of the four gospels; the fourth gives specific testimony for St. Mark; while the apostolic fathers—Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Barnabas—in the very beginning of the second century seem to show in their writings the existence at the time of the gospel books. It is not true that Mr. Barnes would claim any novelty of treatment in these historic citations. Yet it is always profitable to review the testimony of these early witnesses for the canonical books; while their present grouping in compact form makes the treatise of Mr. Barnes particularly useful for handy reference.

Books and Their Use. By JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D., Litt.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Harvard University. 12mo, pp. 94. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

Thirty-two pages of this treatise contain an address delivered before the Harvard Divinity School; fifty pages are filled with a list of books for the use of students of the New Testament, intended to guide "the average theological student" to such works as the author thinks will help him most in the study of biblical philology and archæology, New Testament "Introductions"—including the origin, preservation, dissemination, and interpretation of the New Testament writings—and New Testament times and theology. The list includes lexicons, concordances (all of which are to be surpassed by Dr. James Strong's monumental work), harmonies, grammars, Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias, maps, atlases; besides works on biblical geography, natural history, ethnography, legislation, worship, philosophy, literature, science, and chronology, together with treatises on the formation and history of the New Testament canon, the Greek text, and various translations. Dr. Milton S. Terry's *Hermeneutics* is mentioned first among works on that subject, and is called a *μὲγα βιβλίον*. Dr. B. F. Cocker's *Christianity and Greek Philosophy* is recommended. The *Commentary on Matthew*, by Dr. J. A. Broadus (Baptist), is spoken of as "especially valuable—probably the best in English on that gospel," with the added remark that "its denominationalism is of a mild, tolerant type." All the works of R. C. Trench, H. A. W. Meyer, F. Godet, George P. Fisher, and A. B. Bruce are included. The author gives

warning (which many receive too late) against encyclopedic commentaries like Lange's *Bibelwerk*, "a conspicuous specimen of misdirected labor" with its "avalanches of impertinencies," while its "homiletical and practical" material is positively injurious. No live man ever yet derived aid worth mentioning from such materials, or from "sermon helps," "sketches and outlines," or the like. In early life we bought a few such books, and rejoice to be able to give enthusiastic testimony to their utter worthlessness. We would as soon attend a school where a skeleton sat in the instructor's seat instead of a living teacher as have a library made of such books. If there were to-day a log in the wilderness with a student on one end of it and the dead and exhumed skull of Mark Hopkins on the other, would that be a college? That was not what Garfield said. The preacher must dig out and quarry his own stuff. Ready-made "homiletic helps" are an incumbrance to the man and *impedimenta* in the library. "The perpetual use of crutches will transform a well man into a cripple." Professor Thayer admonishes his students against the passion for novelty. "Experience teaches that what is new is not always true." Historical methods are so recent that present results are provisional and tentative. The power of novelty intoxicates some minds. "So great is scholarly competition in some countries, notably in Germany, that a young writer has little chance of advancement, or even of getting a hearing, unless he broach some notion never heard of before. If it have a flavor of paradox, so much the more likely to gain attention." This state of things is fraught with obvious peril. "Wisdom was not born when we were; some thinking, and not all of it foolish thinking, has been done by former generations."

Christus Consolator; or, Comfortable Words for Burdened Hearts. By GILBERT HAVEN. 12mo, pp. 264. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Great-heart *redivivus*! In this book the radiant personality of Gilbert Haven revisits us. They keep in London a phonograph into which Robert Browning talked. Set it in motion, and out comes the hearty voice, so familiar and so dear to all his friends, repeating to living ears the thoughts and tones uttered on earth years ago by a great thinker now in heaven. Not of him can it be said, "The dead are voiceless." It would be worth an Atlantic voyage just to listen to that phonograph, which, until time and use shall wear it out, will repeat with tireless iteration what Browning said and exactly as he said it—that and nothing else, like Tennyson's little bird, which had but one passage of few notes and sang it over and over throughout the summer days. Such a phonograph is this book; whoever gives it a chance by opening it hears Gilbert Haven talk. Why do we so seldom say Bishop Haven? For the same reason that we habitually say Phillips Brooks, rather than Doctor or Bishop Brooks; because the man was greater than the office (no disrespect to the high office, but an involuntary tribute to the transcendency of the man). There was a good, large, manly manhood toward which we have an affectionate feeling that makes

us want to say Gilbert, and there was in him so little officialness and so much all-brotherliness. Here are the subjects on which Gilbert Haven talks in these chapters: "Two Greek Books on the Life Beyond;" "God Hiding and Revealing Himself;" "The World Vanishing;" "Man Fails, God Abides;" "Taking Children in His Arms;" "Endurance—Happiness;" "The Blessedness of the Blessed Dead;" "The Christian Soldier;" "The Enigma Solved." His son, the Rev. William Ingraham Haven, edits this book and adds a few notes, some of which have a tender interest, especially the last one. The son tells us that his father prepared these papers for the press and purposed publishing them under the title which the book bears. That was more than a dozen years ago. We wonder why we have been kept waiting so long. Was it to make us the more grateful for getting it? Was it to give us such a surprise as one experiences when a belated Christmas gift arrives a fortnight after the day, when we had ceased to expect anything more and had put our remembrances together and numbered them, giving to each its proper due of affectionate appreciation? To Gilbert Haven love and life, sorrow and all relationships human or divine, were great and deep and holy things. Living, he was a minister of consolation to many; departing, he desired to leave this book to comfort others with the same comfort wherewith he himself had been comforted. The two Greek books compared in relation as to the life beyond are the *Odyssey* of Homer and the New Testament of Jesus Christ; the comparison amply setting forth how true it is that in the latter we have a more sure word of prophecy whereunto all men would do well to give heed, since it alone equips our life-voyage with an anchor of hope for the soul. Gilbert Haven was a poet and a seer in that he had the poetic temperament and the prophetic instinct. In this volume there is not a little quoted poetry, noticeably in the chapter on the death of little children. It will be observed that the poetic selections come mostly from Emerson and Browning. The quality of Haven's nature, his intellectual judgment, and his literary taste were such as to enable him to know and choose the best. We pause reluctantly for want of space. This is a book to buy and keep.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Philanthropy and Social Progress. Seven Essays read in the Plymouth School of Applied Ethics, in 1892. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The seven essays in this volume may not inaptly be styled counsels of perfection respecting the social and industrial condition of the country. The Plymouth School of Applied Ethics is one of several attempts to infuse a higher morality into American society, partly by moral suasion and partly by creating legal conditions favorable to a more philanthropic method of managing business. The essays are all instructive; they add to the knowledge of most readers, and they breathe a good spirit. Perhaps it must be that people who give themselves to meditation upon evils shall exaggerate those evils. These essayists have probably not

escaped this defect of their virtue; but they are singularly free from the scorching rhetoric which some groups of reformers wave in our faces. Our life has become so complex that we may well doubt the possibility of a real and equal social intercourse between rich and poor, learned and unlearned; but such a society is presented here as one of the necessary conditions of the salvation of the American people. Much attention is called to the relatively few whose life is a strangerhood—the tramps, in fact or in character—and we recall President Eliot's "forgotten millions," who, in their several groups, not Old World classes, are socially as happy as could be expected. If the world is to be saved by mixing people up without reference to their wishes or fitnesses, or if one wish and one fitness is essential, then we are lost, and there is no help for us. But a long way short of this impossible ideal there may be a great improvement in the relations of people separated by mutual inclination and varying pursuits. It must be of small political consequence how the few rich behave socially toward the few poor so long as sixty millions who are neither rich nor poor practically meet and live together. The society man and the society woman are of no national importance; the poor are of importance, but we incline to the belief that we need no special instruction in applied ethics to enable us—the sixty millions—to do our duty toward them. Our Christian Churches are not neglecting to care for the bodies and for the souls of wrecked people. There is a quiet assumption in these essays—it cannot be meant—that the sixty millions need a great ethical uplifting, and that nobody is doing the uplifting; whereas, in point of fact, a good deal is done every Sunday in each year of our Lord. It is the first condition of a sound theory that the facts shall be known and recognized. Father Huntington, in the fourth essay, seems to us to grasp only a part of the facts; for he almost ignores the distinctions between God's poor, man's poor, and the devil's poor. All three need, too, not a benefactor or two, but the holy religion with which John Wesley lifted up the poor of England, multitudes of them, into comfort through their personal industry. This essayist indulges freely in incidents, but in most cases they concern exceptional lives. Whatever can be done to put a better spirit into our society and into our business should be attempted. Books like this will, doubtless, help the pastors and elect women of the land to wage war on selfishness, oppression, and poverty; but many will be repelled by the one-sidedness and the theorizing of these essays from putting much faith in any new gospel or in patented applications of the dear old Gospel of Jesus. The question confronting us beneath the surface of this book is not solved by our trying to be better Christians in spirit and conduct. To satisfy the demand of these applications of ethics we must do some new things, vote for some new laws, organize something better than soul-saving Churches. It is certain that the sixty millions can learn something from these essays, but it is not so certain that the right new things to do, the right new laws to vote for, or the right new organizations are suggested in the book. To our mind the three hundred thousand conversions in Methodist churches

during this twelvemonth will do more for all the good ends reached out after in this book than the entire body of theoretical reformers can accomplish in a century. Ethical redemption must still depend upon divine redemption. The oppressive silence of these essays about the active and effective philanthropy of evangelical Christianity is a sign, not of the times, but of a singular blindness in some men of these times. Nor is this our last word. Will ethical redemption redeem? Has not history answered this in the negative? The last of these essays, by Dr. Bernard Bosanquet, of London, is a contrast to the other six. It is a very valuable account by an expert of the unifying and intensifying of charitable work in London. American theorizing stands out in bold unlikeness to this British practical philanthropy. The problem the latter are setting for solution is how to set poor people on their feet, not by wholesale, but man by man, family by family.

Tools and the Man. Property and Industry under the Christian Law. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D. 16mo. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, \$1.25.

Dr. Gladden has in this volume attempted to guide the Christian spirit in its effort to enforce in industrial life "the broad equities and the obligations" of our religion. He discusses "Economics and Christian Ethics," "Property in Land," and other questions much debated in our day, with a considerable breadth of knowledge and a good deal of reasonableness. Possibly the "collapse of competition" is not as serious as he believes; but that Christianity, if it is to endure, must leaven competition all good men clearly see. He finds in our religion, not merely an ideal, but "the only workable theory of industrial and social order." This is of course broadly true, the golden rule being the only rule capable of producing a perfect society; and every social expedient, theory, or system which is not leavened with the spirit of that rule must, sooner or later, fail. In some parts of this book Dr. Gladden makes one feel that he lacks vigorous grasp on the individualistic method of Christianity. It refuses to divide the estate, but warns the litigants to beware of covetousness. The application of a Christian principle by society's enforcing a just division—by arbitration, for example—is a matter over which many sincere Christians hesitate. To those who have no hesitation Dr. Gladden will be very comforting; and those who hesitate will hope that moral coercion—the love of Christ which constrains—will so pervade the enforcement of love that the divisor will really and justly divide. We altogether agree with Dr. Gladden, that Christianity alone can solve social problems; we are not sure, as he seems to be, that he has found the practical lines of that solution. We found out some fifty years back that our religion does not contain a detailed science of geology; it may be our lot to find out in the next generation that it does not contain a detailed system of social science, and especially of organized industries. The principles of a sound sociology are in Christianity. And now that the Christian world is manifestly anxious to incorporate these vital principles in social and industrial

life we may hope to make progress, if not in the precise ways of Dr. Gladden's book, at least in Christianized ways of industrial order and distribution. Our author has persuaded himself that a Christian socialism requires us to manage the telegraph as a national enterprise, though he gives no analysis of the question. Now, applied Christianity might make a mistake in this matter; and men as pious and as enlightened as Dr. Gladden very seriously doubt that a government telegraph would be a whit more Christian than those we now use with clear conscience. Our author falters over government management of railways. "It is a great and difficult problem." But many good Christians think the same might be said of the telegraph; while other good Christians are confident that the government ought to run railroads, mills, mines, and farms. We hope we are not entering upon a period in which socialistic opinions will be used to test the soundness of the faith of believers.

Socialism and the American Spirit. By NICHOLAS PAINE GILMAN. Crown Svo. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, \$1.50.

It was a happy thought of the above author to test socialistic theories by the American spirit. The result is a book worth careful reading and likely to arrest the attention and restrain the enthusiasm of the more rational portion of the idealistic reformers. The book is necessarily more or less a brief for one side of the case; but the eloquent pleader urges others to study economic facts, and in his own study of profit-sharing shows us how practical study may help a good theory to obtain a respectable standing. The American spirit is, Mr. Gilman believes, too optimistic to surrender to socialistic reform by wholesale and too practical to go far on unexplored roads. The great body of people in this country who are neither rich nor poor have philanthropic sympathy and purpose, but if they are asked to adopt any scheme of reform they desire first of all to be made acquainted with the means to the desired end. They accept the principle of a more evenly distributed enjoyment of material good, but they will not act until the way to act effectively is made clear to them. The American spirit is too cheery for thoroughgoing socialism. We are too hopeful that we shall come out all right to take very seriously to heart the warning that the individualistic and competitive order is carrying us down to ruin. This spirit accepts the individual and his virtues of industry, courage, and honesty as a prime cause of all prosperity. It distrusts the outcome of an order depending on something else. But, on the other hand, this spirit has a strong tendency to restrain and kill any and every rebellion of the individual against the well-being of other men or of society at large. In fact, our American way is to make the individual and society keep house together, not so much by compromise methods as by shedding light on the place and duties of each and drawing lines of law and public opinion as fast as the light shows where to draw them. American philanthropy is not concerned about men as "the masses," but as persons having stomachs and souls but having also duties and obligations. We see clearly enough that good reform is for the relief

of flesh-and-blood individuals. A valuable explanation of the enthusiasm which greets ideal schemes and utopias is that the American is as fond of hearing some new thing as the Athenians were; but he is still very slow to act on new lines. The American spirit is human and practical in its benevolence, preferring the Good Samaritan to the theorist or sentimentalist. Our author is conservative in the best sense, and in the same sense progressive. He would keep, for example, the wages system, but he would modify and improve it by profit-sharing and other devices. He sees no prospect of a capital-owning and labor-employing State. That is not the way in which the American spirit seeks to make a man and a society fitted to the man and producing men. Mr. Gilman finds a proper satisfaction in the social discontent and unrest which keeps company with American optimism. The unrest is a result of our prosperity, of the relative ease in which many live, having leisure to bewail the woes of the less fortunate and the evils of human life—not always seeing that some of these evils cannot be remedied, but optimistically hoping to cure us of all our diseases. The author occasionally falls into the error of unscientific judgment, as when, to cite a single example, he assumes that our agriculture is now carried on under special difficulties and proceeds to account for it. The fact and the explanation may be challenged. Whenever the farmer adds to the old-fashioned virtues of industry and thrift the higher intelligence required by much use of machinery on the modern farm, he will be found in a condition of ideal prosperity. The tariffs of the last quarter century may as reasonably be invoked to explain this kind of prosperity as to account for the failures of the indolent, unthrifty, and unintelligent farmer. Probably the tariffs have no special bearing on the good or bad results in this branch of industry. A careful observer will not miss the large fact that the low price of farms is the alleged proof of the hardships of the farmer, nor will he fail to notice that these low prices are low compared with those of the inflation period of 1862-69, when farm values and all others were doubled by the use of a depreciated currency. Good farms are not cheap relatively to any other standard.

A Ramble Among Surnames. By Rev. J. W. DANIEL, A.M. 12mo, pp. 268. Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Barbee & Smith, Agents. Price, cloth, 80 cents.

This readable and interesting volume makes use of the latest and fullest fruits of research in the line of historic study of which it treats. It has for every reader a piquant personal interest, from the probability that in perusing its pages he may catch a glimpse of his own family record. Most of us can find our own names here. Bits of history from far-off centuries and vanished tribes are folded up and buried in words wherein the records wait for whoever will take the trouble to exhumate and unswathe the mummied meaping. Sandstone confesses the ancient waves which washed it in the ripple record on its face. The oak keeps under its bark in concentric circles the register of all its summers. Family names tell tales of origins and occupations. Mr. Daniel's ex-

lent book blends amusement with instruction, spicy incident and sprightly fancy with etymology, philology, and history. The chapter headings indicate the range and classification: "English Surnames that Make Us Laugh;" "Patronymic Inheritances from Remote Fatherlands;" "Surnames Derived from the Signs of Shopkeepers;" "Surnames Derived from the Occupations;" "Surnames Derived from Places of Residence;" "The Smiths, Browns, Blacks, and Railroads;" "Surnames which Embody the Anglo-Saxon Idea of Home;" "Islands, Fords, and Lakes," as origins of names; "Surnames from Civil and Religious Offices;" "Gaelic Surnames." Strange phases of human nature appear in names. A foundling picked out of an ash heap was named Job Cinere Extractus. The stern asceticism of the Puritans appears in the severe names, such as Dust-and-Ashes, which they inflicted on their innocent newborn offspring. Some optimistic, sunny soul, whose beaming face lit the gloom of a day of darkness now far gone, is immortalized in the family name of Lovejoy. Swinburne means "hog-branch." Haygood is "good hedge." Sterling is "easterling," immigrant from the East. Chapman is Norse, and means "merchant" or "peddler," equivalent to the German *Kaufmann*. Osborne means "the bear of the gods." Parker was "the keeper of the park" or woods. Palmer bore about a palm leaf in token that he had been to the Holy Land. Coward was a "cow-warden," who looked after the kine. Warren was "the keeper of the warren," an inclosed place, a preserve for herds, flocks, and birds. Bancroft means "a wood infested with outlaws." Garfield is "spear field." Hurst is Anglo-Saxon—"a thick woods." The Clevelandes were originally "the cliff-dwellers." Ridpath was "a man who lived by the road," and not on a byway. Washington was a man who built his hut on low ground subject to inundation by the overflow of some neighboring water or by freshets. John means "the Lord's grace." William means "the helmet of resolution." Billing is the son and Billings the grandson of Will. We have sufficiently indicated the character and contents of this diverting and beguiling book.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne. By HORATIO BRIDGE, Paymaster-General, United States Navy. 16mo, pp. 200. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Hawthorne, called by some the greatest of American romance writers, is known through a variety of biographies: *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, by his son Julian; *A Study of Hawthorne*, by his son-in-law Lathrop; sketches by Fields, Curtis, Stoddard, and others; a literary study of his works by Henry James; and a *Life*, by Moncure D. Conway. The present volume has sufficient distinctive character and fresh material to justify its publication; indeed, some of those mentioned could be better spared than these personal reminiscences of Hawthorne's "oldest and truest friend." Conway fails to comprehend Hawthorne and is unjust to him.

This volume shows us the man in a familiar, old-friendly sort of way. When he looks to losing his Liverpool consulate he writes: "Doubtless it will all turn out for the best. All through my life I have had occasion to observe that what seemed to be misfortunes have proved in the end to be the best things that could possibly happen to me; and so it will be in this, even though the mode in which it benefits me should never be made clear to my apprehension." Perhaps he was remembering the loss of his surveyorship in the Salem custom house, which compelled him to return to his pen for bread and gave to the world the *Scarlet Letter*, and to him more money and fame than he had ever had. That a man does nothing well unless he likes his work seems disproved by frequent declarations of Hawthorne that the sight of a pen makes him sick and that he detests writing; his wife answering his friend's letter for him because, she says, "he has an utter detestation of pen, ink, and paper." In all the twenty years of James Russell Lowell's professorship his duties never became easy to him. A letter dated 1867 says: "I begin my annual dissatisfaction of lecturing next Wednesday. I cannot get used to it. All my nightmares are of lecturing." A poor girl who had to sell roses every day for a living, being asked if she loved flowers, answered, "I hate them!" Hawthorne was a war Democrat. An accurate foresight appears in the following, written in 1861 to the author of this book: "I don't quite understand what we are fighting for, or what definite result can be expected. If we are fighting for the annihilation of slavery, to be sure, it may be a wise object and offers a tangible result, and the only one which is consistent with a future reunion between North and South. A continuance of the war would soon make this plain to us, and we should see the expediency of preparing our black brethren for future citizenship by allowing them to fight for their own liberties and educating them through heroic influences."

Short History of the Christian Church. With Maps. By JOHN FLETCHER HURST, D.D., LL.D. 8vo, pp. 672. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$3.

If any evidence were needed of the superlative worth of church history it is made plain in such a treatise as this of Bishop Hurst's. Among the various purposes of historical theology the supervision of Providence over his earthly interests is clearly taught. "In the history of the Church," states the author, "the divine superintendence has been far more prominent. While in secular history the spiritual forces lay largely in the background, in the life of the Church they have come out boldly into the clear foreground. . . . The office of the historian of the Church is not to untie a tangled skein, but to follow the golden thread of the divine presence in all Christian ages." For the interpretation of ecclesiastical history on such a basis Bishop Hurst has long since shown his special gift. In the present instance he has rearranged, and in places rewritten, his five Short Histories already published. The parts into which the entire field is divided by this new grouping are five: The Early Church (A. D. 30-750), The Mediæval Church (A. D. 750-1517), The Reformation

(A. D. 1517-1545), The Modern Church in Europe (A. D. 1558-1892), The Church in the United States (A. D. 1492-1892). It is difficult to see how a compendium covering these long periods could discriminate more wisely between the important and the nonessential and present the former only, or how it were possible to gain greater lucidity within so small a compass. Of particular value seems the treatment of the European Church in the Modern Period and the Church in the United States, and to these the student will often turn for enlightenment. The summary of literature at the commencement of each chapter is also a new and valuable feature. The bishop, in a word, has done all that he might to make the record of the Christian Church a clear and fascinating story.

Methodism in Buffalo. From its Origin to the Close of 1892. By SANDFORD HUNT, D.D. 12mo, pp. 256. Buffalo: H. H. Otis & Sons. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book, prepared at the urgent suggestion of that most useful, most generous, and most honored of Buffalo laymen, Francis H. Root, whose recent death Methodism so greatly mourns, is a valuable contribution to the archives of local history. Probably no man now alive is better qualified by long and general acquaintance and by active participation to write the history of Buffalo Methodism than is Dr. Hunt, our senior book agent at New York, who has found time, amid his multiplicity of duties and responsibilities, to gather the scattered materials from the fields of the past and arrange them in their true chronological and evolutionary order. For many years Dr. Hunt has been largely identified with Methodist affairs in Buffalo, having been pastor of a number of churches in the city, as well as Presiding Elder of Buffalo District; nor has he, in the years since he was removed from that neighborhood to the book agency, lost interest in or sympathetic touch with the Methodism of his former home. The Methodist preachers, from Glezen Fillmore down to the pastors of to-day, are named and to some extent described, as also the presiding elders, from Gideon Draper to the present; and the entire list is tabulated to be read at a glance at the end of the book. The church edifices are described and most of them presented in picture, from the first building erected on Franklin Street, just below Niagara Street, twenty-five by thirty-five feet, in 1818, down to the more than twenty Methodist Episcopal churches which now grace that goodly city, including the massive and substantial Delaware Avenue cathedral, and looking to even greater things in the proposed pile suggested for Richmond Avenue. The contents of this volume will become more valuable with years. It should be followed by like volumes in all parts of our country, one for each of our important cities, gathering up, setting in order, and saving for all the future the histories of each locality. It is only just to the fathers, to ourselves, and to posterity to multiply historical societies, museums, cabinets, and such books as Dr. Hunt's, to the end that a great Church may be possessed of its own history and able to answer when interrogated concerning facts which belong to its development and life. This volume would have been more satisfactory to us and to many if it had contained in its portrait

gallery the faces of its author and of that faithful and useful servant of the Church, Mr. H. H. Otis, manager of our Book Depository at Buffalo. The book closes with an interesting chapter on the session of the General Conference in Buffalo in 1860, with glimpses of Peter Cartwright, William H. Milburn, J. B. Wakeley, Father Taylor, and many others.

Pagan and Christian Rome. Profusely Illustrated. By RODOLFO LANCIANI. Author of *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*. 8vo, pp. 374. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, ornamented cloth, \$6.

That Rome was first pagan is like the voice of history and of archaeology. That it was later Christian is also the historic showing and the archaeological testimony. But to point out the *nexus* between these two periods and the extent of the transformation is an undertaking that is not altogether easy. In fact, the change seems to have been a gradual process. "We must not believe," remarks Lanciani, "that the transformation of Rome from a pagan into a Christian city was a sudden and unexpected event, which took the world by surprise. It was the natural result of the work of three centuries, brought to maturity under Constantine by an inevitable reaction against the violence of Diocletian's rule. It was not a revolution or a conversion in the true sense of these words; it was the official recognition of a state of things which had long ceased to be a secret. . . . The revolution was an exceedingly mild one, the transformation almost imperceptible. . . . Many institutions and customs still flourishing in our days are of classical origin, and were adopted or tolerated because they were not in opposition to Christian principles." So pacific, in fact, was Christianity toward the earlier paganism that it permitted the continuance of various heathen institutions side by side with its own. To show this fact seems particularly the purpose of the present elaborate volume. According to the ancient guide-books of Rome, issued in the middle of the fourth century, there were 424 pagan temples, 304 shrines, 80 statues of gods of precious metal, 64 of ivory, and 3,785 miscellaneous bronze statues—among them being the *Ara Maxima Herculis*, the *Roma Quadrata*, and the *Sacellum Statoris*. But of Christian churches, among them being private oratories, *scholæ*, oratories and churches built over the tombs of martyrs and confessors, and pagan monuments converted into churches, there were also a large number—the "great catalogue" of Cardinal Mai enrolling over a thousand places of worship. Imperial tombs of pagan emperors there also were, as the mausoleum of Augustus, the tomb of Nero, or that of the Flavian emperors. But there were also the mausoleums of Christian emperors and later of popes, adorned with manifold inscriptions, carvings, and statues. Pagan cemeteries, besides, were in existence, and afterward Christian cemeteries, whose diverse inscriptions and adornments indicated the divergence of the two faiths. In such a line of parallelism does the author proceed in his present volume. As one who enjoys unusual facilities for accurate observation and who seems thoroughly conversant with the Roman history whereof he writes, he has contributed an

small volume to the library of archæology. In addition to which considerations its charming letterpress and exquisite engravings make the work a treasure to be much desired.

A Tour Around New York, and My Summer Acre. Being the Recreations of Mr. Felix Oldboy. Illustrated by JOHN FLAVEL MINES, LL.D. 12mo, pp. 518. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$3.

Every great metropolis has had its evolution. Whoever thinks of it only as a crowded market place where all else is subordinated to trade forgets that the law of growth has in all such instances had its illustration. Nor is the great metropolis of the western continent an exception to the rule. There was an old New York. It was unlike the New York of the present, and perhaps was its superior in some respects. The warehouses had not crowded out the comfortable residences in its lower sections, and the greedy, soulless trafficker had not displaced the sentimentalist upon its streets. If entertaining the dream of coming preeminence among the cities of the world as a port of trade, it had not yet dedicated all its powers to mammon nor forgotten to keep alive the tenderer emotions of the soul. What the older New York was we learn in the present volume. The writer was himself "to the manner born." Many things which he saw in his boyhood days, as well as other things that were described to him by older lips, are woven into his graceful story. The most pathetic retrospect, the happiest sentiment, the most refined humor—as delicate as an angel's speech—blend on his pages. Sometimes he recalls important events in earlier metropolitan history about which an air of legend has already gathered; sometimes he tells of the architecture of other days; sometimes he draws the pictures of leading personages in the former city life. He does not say too much. There is nothing inserted that the reader would wish to omit. For all who belong to New York, by birth or by adoption, no volume more charming has of late appeared than this grouping of anecdotes, personal memories, and traditions so gracefully made by Mr. Felix Oldboy.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Our Brother in Yellow. A Sermon Delivered in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Boston, Sunday Morning, May 21, 1893: By Rev. LOUIS ALBERT BANKS, D.D., Author of *The People's Christ*; *White Slaves, or The Oppression of the Worthy Poor*; *The Revival Quiver*; and *Common Folks' Religion*. Pp. 29. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, paper, 15 cents.

Another indictment and another plea against the attitude and action of the United States and for the persecuted Chinamen. A sermon well worth printing in itself, and needed as an aid in educating public sentiment. Its spirit is indicated by the quoted words of Joseph Mazzini, the great Italian: "Foremost and grandest amid the teachings of Christ were these two inseparable truths—*There is but one God; all men are the sons of God.* The promulgation of these two truths changed the face of the world and enlarged the moral circle to the confines of the inhabited globe. To

the duties of men toward the family and country were added duties toward humanity. Man then learned that wheresoever there existed a human being there existed a brother; a brother with a soul immortal as his own, destined like himself to ascend toward the Creator, and on whom he was bound to bestow love, a knowledge of the faith, and help and counsel when needed."

Twice Tried. By ANNIE S. SWAN, Author of *Gates of Eden*, etc. 12mo, pp. 236. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

The Young Pilgrim. A Story Illustrative of the Pilgrim's Progress. Four Illustrations. By A. L. O. E. 16mo, pp. 354. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

Christmas Times in the Crocus Family. Three Illustrations. By ROBIN RANGER. 16mo, pp. 262. Price, cloth, 45 cents.

The Little Chicken Thieves. By W. A. ROBINSON, D.D., Pastor of Union M. Church, Covington, Ky. 12mo, pp. 145. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

Bright Nook; or, Aunt Maggie's Corner. Two Illustrations. By GLANCE GAYLORD. 16mo, pp. 138. Price, cloth, 40 cents.

How Marjorie Watched, and Little Foxes. Five Illustrations. By the Author of *Helena's Cloud*, etc. 12mo, pp. 336. Price, cloth, 80 cents.

Joy the Deaconess. By ELIZABETH E. HOLDING. 12mo, pp. 213. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

Helena's Cloud With the Silver Lining, and What the Angels Saw on Christmas Eve. By the Author of *How Marjorie Watched*, etc. 12mo, pp. 316. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

The above are late Sunday school books issued by Hunt & Eaton, at New York, and Cranston & Curtis, at Cincinnati. Wholesome in teaching and attractive in print, they deserve a place in all Sabbath school libraries.

The London Daily Press. With Illustrations and Portraits. By H. W. MASSINGHAM. 12mo, pp. 192. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

Of the power of the daily press for good or ill, for ruin or reform, no denial may be attempted. Of the power particularly of the press of London, as one of the great centers of human activity, a new conception will be gained from the scrutiny of Mr. Massingham's book. Such dailies as the *Times*, *Standard*, *News*, *Telegraph*, and *Chronicle*, as well the many evening papers of London, receive for the purpose a sufficient mention. The portraits of many of the great journalists of London add to the interest of the book. Whoever reads will be impressed anew with the marvelous activity of the human mind in its application to editorial service.

Must the Chinese Go? An Examination of the Chinese Question. By Mrs. S. L. BALDWIN, Eighteen Years a Missionary in China. Third edition. Pamphlet, pp. 29. New York: Press of H. B. Elkins, 15 Vandewater Street.

Few persons living know more about the Chinese question than Mrs. Baldwin. The wrongs of the injured have seldom had a more impressive setting forth. This pamphlet is a reiterated cry for justice, a solemn arraignment of legislative cruelty, and a righteous warning to this nation from the grieved and angered soul of a noble Christian woman filled with enthusiasm for humanity, a passion for righteousness, and love for God.

METHODIST REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

ART. I.—EVOLUTION AND EVOLUTION.

THE utterances about evolution have become a veritable confusion of tongues. Evolution itself is variously conceived as a process and as a mysterious cause with something like divine attributes; and the doctrine ranks all the way from a harmless scientific theory to one of the most portentous of the unfruitful works of darkness. Judging by what one reads, the doctrine is not always overclearly conceived by scientific men themselves; and to make matters worse it has fallen a prey to magazine scientists and ecclesiastical rhetoricians. Scarcely an anti-religious firework is let off nowadays without a reference to evolution, while as a ground of rhetorical shudders on the part of the clergy it has come to outrank even "science, falsely so called." We have been often, and somewhat truculently, informed that evolution has put a new face on all the perennial problems of thought and life and has permanently vacated most of our traditional ideas. Accordingly we have the new science, the new psychology, the new philosophy, the new ethics, and many other alleged novelties, of which no one may speak lightly, under penalty of perishing miserably in his gain-sayings. Thus evolution has made all things new.

Yet even the kindest critic must admit that most of the utterances upon this subject, friendly and hostile alike, show more polemical bustle and rancor than clear and critical thought. Many handy phrases, some of them notable contributions to the dictionary, are kept a-going; and these often enable voluble persons of the slenderest gifts to assume an air of

wisdom which would, if it were possible, deceive the very elect. Homogeneities and heterogeneities, differentiation and integration, correspondence and environment—what a part they have played! And how verbal and barren the process is—verbal identifications and deductions, distinguishing nothing, leading to nothing, and commonly meaning nothing! For in all the popular din about evolution what is most noticeable is neither truth nor error, but confusion, that prolific mother of nonsense. Our first work must be to unravel.

Official definitions of evolution do not tend to edification. They are commonly imposing and sonorous formulas, but are empty of valuable substance. We shall do better, therefore, to work our way into the subject without a formal definition. And first we note that the doctrine may have two distinct meanings. It may be a description of the genesis and history of the facts to which it is applied, or it may be such description, plus a theory of their causes. In other words, evolution may be a description of the order of phenomenal development, or it may be a metaphysical theory of the causes which underlie that order. These two conceptions are seldom distinguished, and it is their confusion or conglomeration which makes evolution such a bugbear on the one hand and so immensely significant on the other. For the sake of clearness and progress we must keep these conceptions distinct.

Evolution as a description of the order of genesis and development would run somewhat as follows: The simplest and lowest forms of existence were first and were succeeded by higher and more complex forms. Nothing begins ready-made. The present has grown out of the past, the complex out of the simple, the high out of the low, the heterogeneous out of the homogeneous. In the inorganic world it claims that if we should trace its history backward we should find simpler and simpler physical conditions, until we came to some simple state of dispersed matter—say a nebulous cloud. In the organic world it holds that if we should trace present living forms backward along genealogical lines we should find these lines converging toward a common starting-point. The forms of life would grow simpler, until in some very simple form or forms we should find the starting-point from which the complex forms of to-day have been developed. By continuous differ-

tiation and slight advances the original low and simple forms have been unfolded into an indefinite variety of higher and more complex forms. Again, in the evolution of mind, whether in the individual or in the world, we find the beginnings in mere animal sentience; and out of this the higher forms of mentality emerge by a progressive and continuous development. Finally, the same is true for society. The first stages are the simplest and crudest; and from these advance is made to the complexity of our present civilization.

Now, evolution in this sense is simply a description of an order, a statement of what, granting the theory, an observer might have seen if he had been able to inspect the cosmic movement from its simplest stages until now. It is a statement of method and is silent about causation, and the method itself is compatible with any kind of causation. This conception of the phenomenal history of the world and life, as showing such a continuous progress from the simple to the complex, from the low to the high, we may call the doctrine of evolution in its scientific sense. It lies within the field of science and is open to scientific proof or disproof. Whenever the doctrine transcends this field and claims to give a theory of the causes at work it then becomes metaphysics, and must be handed over to philosophical criticism for adjudication.

Evolution, then, in the scientific sense, is neither a controlling law nor a producing cause, but simply a description of a phenomenal order. Concerning it we may ask two questions: 1. Is it true? 2. If it be true, what of it? The first question we pass over with the remark that experience plainly shows it to have a large measure of truth, and that philosophical criticism commonly makes one increasingly suspicious of all inductive formulas which lay claim to absolute truth. The second question has often called out in reply not a little bad logic and some pernicious blundering. In popular thought and hearsay science many things pass for evolution which are no part of the scientific doctrine, and which often are little more than a mirage of misunderstood words. The answer to the second question will turn out to be that all fundamental problems remain what they were before. The fancy that the doctrine has a profound philosophical significance is one of the popular mistakes due to a superficial philosophy.

Let us begin with cosmic evolution, as this is a favorite field with the popular speculator. Suppose, then, an order of phenomenal progress and continuity such as evolution in the scientific sense affirms. It is plain that it tells us nothing concerning the agent or agents which found and maintain the order, and nothing concerning their relation to the order. Are the real causes material or spiritual? Are they within the movement, or are they its ground, separate and apart? Is the causation internal to the process, or is the process only the successive manifestation of a causality beyond itself? All of these questions remain open. The crude fancy that we are gazing directly upon the causes of the natural order and their causality has long been an anachronism. The cause, whatever it may be, is never to be sought among the phenomena. Its nature can be learned, if at all, only by speculative inference from the phenomena. The facts themselves contain no theory of causation. This is so much the case that one might hold to the phenomenal order and yet contend, with Hume and Mill, that causation means only invariable sequence, so that no one of these facts is the source or ground of any other. Or one might hold, with many other philosophers, that matter has no real efficiency, and that efficiency is to be found only in mind. In that case physical changes take place according to rule; but the true cause or agent is mind outside of the physical series. One might even hold that the entire cosmic system is but the form under which a divine activity proceeds, and has no substantiality in itself. Finally, one might adopt an agnostic or positivistic view and, disclaiming any knowledge of causes, limit the mind to a knowledge of phenomena only. Any one of these views is as compatible with the facts as is the common notion which refers them to material and mechanical causes.

It is plain, then, that there might be entire unanimity concerning evolution in the scientific sense along with complete disharmony in its metaphysical interpretation. In such cases we have at bottom, not a scientific difference, but a battle of philosophies. The theorists agree on the facts, but interpret them by different schemes of metaphysics. This is the reason why some thinkers find in evolution a veritable aid to faith, while others are unable to see in it anything but atheism. And the latter class are not entirely without excuse, owing

to the failure to keep the scientific and the metaphysical questions apart. By consequence most discussions of evolution have openly or tacitly assumed a philosophy of nature which readily lends itself to atheism. Certain crude metaphysical notions spring up naturally in minds which live only or mainly in the senses. Matter is made real and causal and easily passes as self-sufficient. What the senses do not report does not exist. The causality of the system is material and mechanical as a matter of course. Nature is erected into a self-contained and self-sufficient system, and natural laws are viewed as self-executing necessities. Not a little of our cosmic speculation is built upon these crude and naïve notions. Under their influence evolution is declared to maintain natural causation against supernatural causation, and continuity and uniformity against break and irruption. This antithesis has become a standing part of the popular discussion.

It is worth noting, also, that much of the current argument ill comports with the underlying philosophy. It is somehow supposed that natural causation secures phenomenal continuity and progress, and, conversely, that such continuity is especially favorable to the belief in natural causation. But there is absolutely no necessary connection between natural causation, in the sense of material or physical or necessary causation, and the law of evolution, in the sense of gradual progress from simple to complex. Natural causation, in the sense mentioned, contains no provision whatever for uniformity or progress. For all we can say such causation might have a purely kaleidoscopic effect and might perpetually cancel its own products. The continuity of physical causes and forces would be compatible with the most chaotic sequences of phenomena, and the system might advance by perpetual explosion and catastrophe. If the actual system does not thus proceed it is not because it is natural, but because it is confined by its laws and the relation of its parts to orderly and progressive movement.

On the other hand, if we assume that nature is a self-inclosed, self-executing mechanical order, what significance for the evolution argument is there in the presence or absence of missing links or in the fact of progress by slow gradation? This conception of nature does, indeed, imply that every product must be the result of its antecedents, but it implies no given

order or measure of likeness. In a system assumed to be self-executing, the present grows out of the past as a matter of course, or rather as a matter of definition. Missing links might modify our conception of the order of procedure, but would not affect our general view of causation. Sometimes the speculators have a suspicion of this fact, and point out that the absence of missing links is no necessary part of the evolution doctrine. The great thing is to maintain the continuity of natural causation, whatever the breaks and faults of the phenomenal order. Evolution, it is said, permits us to recognize any number of phenomenal fractures if only we reject all interference with natural causation. The work must be natural and must be carried on by "resident forces" if it is to be true evolutionary doctrine. But by this time the question is completely changed, and a metaphysical contention is substituted for a scientific one. So little are the popular writers on this subject masters of their own thought that they are seldom clearly conscious of their own aim, and thus oscillate confusedly between the scientific and the metaphysical view without any suspicion that either is not the other or that the two are not one. Thus the confusion of popular thought is increased. Scientific facts and metaphysical interpretations, inductive and speculative problems, are mixed in unsuspected confusion. Manifest facts are ruled out in the name of irrelevant metaphysics, and metaphysical criticism is opposed by facts which have no bearing. A plentiful supply of epithets, ejaculations, and rhetorical shudders meets all remaining demands.

Now, there is no way out of this confusion except by keeping separate things separate and by defining to ourselves our own aim. If we are seeking to discover the phenomenal successions of things and to show that they shade into one another, so that we can pass back and forth without mental jolt, our aim is scientific and we have no need of metaphysics, but only of inductive logic. If we are seeking to exhibit the causes of such an order our aim is metaphysical and should be recognized as such. For the scientific aim the search for missing links is intelligible, since if they abounded they would make the continuous gradation of things impossible. If, on the other hand, our aim is metaphysical and we are seeking to maintain, say, the continuity of natural causation, the question of missing links has no im-

portance, for the notion of natural causation is compatible with any measure of phenomenal disorder and disruption. But it is very important that we decide what natural causation is to mean in antithesis to supernatural, and what continuity is to mean in distinction from mere succession. It is also important that we prove that such causation exists and that nature, as a self-inclosed mechanical system, is anything more than an idol of the dogmatic den.

But in the noisy discussions of the subject we miss all definition of the natural and supernatural, save that the natural is crudely conceived as made up of matter and necessity, while what passes for the supernatural is made up partly of gross and grotesque sense images and partly of echoes of an obsolete deism. Meanwhile the search for missing links has been carried on, less from the scientific desire to exhibit the successive phenomena of the world in a continuous scheme than from a vague fancy in the mind of the speculator that, in a material system, progress would lose its wonder and would need no explanation if we supposed it to take place by imperceptible degrees and to be extended over long periods of time. This fancy, which is shared by friends and foes alike, rests upon the further fancy that in some obscure way time, if it were long enough, might introduce new factors which have not always been an essential implication of the system. This fancy disappears as soon as we master the significance of law.

Evolution, then, in the scientific sense, carries with it no theory of metaphysics; for the question of method is forever distinct from the question of cause. But in popular thought evolution is identified with materialistic and mechanical metaphysics; and this has served to bring it into disrepute. That the two have no necessary connection is plain upon inspection. Natural causation, in the sense of material causation, in no way secures order and progress; and, on the other hand, supernatural causation, in the sense of volitional and intelligent activity, is by no means inconsistent with uniformity of procedure and progress by slow advance. From the bare notion of natural causation we can infer nothing as to the mode of its manifestation; nor, from the bare notion of supernatural causation, can we infer anything as to its method of manifestation. And it is the same confusion of scientific evolution with crude

metaphysics which has led so many to identify evolution with atheism, or at least to hold that it lends great aid and comfort to atheism. But the trouble here is not in the facts, but in the metaphysics by which the facts are interpreted. The belief, however, is so widespread that it seems worth while to show that scientific evolution does not affect the theistic argument at all.

In the popular view of evolution the doctrine is not simply the description of a phenomenal order or a complex result of hidden causation; it is also and more especially a mechanical and materialistic theory of its causes. When, then, evolution is said to be a progress from the simple to the complex, from the indefinite to the definite, from the low to the high, this is assumed to mean that simple and self-sufficient matter, without relation to intelligence and by its own laws, is able to produce all the higher forms of existence; so that they are no longer to be viewed as the outcome of purpose, but only as the product of blind physical law and self-executing necessity. Matter in crude thought is always viewed as the antithesis and negation of intelligence; and anything ascribed to matter is thereby removed from the control of mind. Now, the original simple forms of matter are supposed to have shown no trace of the higher aspects of the universe and to have been essentially indifferent to them. The former, then, are the true reality, while the latter are only passing phases or products of matter, which, in turn, is essentially mechanical and unintelligent. Hence the horror with which evolution has been regarded in religious circles, and the frantic favor with which it has been received by the irreligious. It seemed to be a demonstration of atheism; and the prophecy of Comte seemed to be fulfilled, that science would yet conduct God to the frontier and bow him out with thanks for his provisional services. The reality of material causation was taken for granted; and evolution was supposed to have proved that there is no need to assume intelligence in order to explain all the apparent purpose in the world. We see matter, it was said, under the control of law, producing even the highest forms of existence; and God is demonstrably a needless, if not an inadmissible, hypothesis.

Now, evolution in this sense is simply a piece of bad logic and metaphysics, and in no way a fact of science. It is the traditional atheistic philosophy with a new firm name, but with

no real increase of capital. It is a mistaken inference from a scientific doctrine which arises very naturally in the crude thinking of minds in bondage to the senses and to words; but science itself is in no way responsible for it. Logically it is an attempt to deduce effects without providing for them in their causes, or to deduce conclusions from premises which do not contain them. Evolution, as a description of appearances, may teach that the apparently simple preceded the apparently complex; but evolution, as a theory of causes, can never proceed from the simple to the complex or from the low to the high. In any scheme of necessary causation the antecedents must imply the consequents, and can be adequately defined only in terms of their implications. In short, evolution, as an ultimate causal explanation, is either absurd or empty, and for the following reasons:

All scientific thinking is determined by the notion of law. Like causes must have like effects. Given causes can have only given effects. Conversely, given effects can be traced only to definite causes, which necessitate just those effects to the exclusion of all others. Hence, in reasoning back from effects to causes we have to determine our thought of the causes so as to include the effects. Now, under such a law of thought we can never pass by regressive reasoning from the complex to the simple, nor by progressive reasoning from the simple to the complex, except in appearance. In reality, if we begin with the complex we can never reach the simple; and if we begin with the simple we can never reach the complex. Thus, if the present state of things is to be explained, we refer it to a past state of things. To-day is explained by yesterday. What, then, was yesterday? It was not merely yesterday as it may have appeared, but it was a yesterday with to-day potential in it. Whoever could have understood yesterday as it was would have seen that to-day was necessarily implied in it. Hence, our explanation of to-day by yesterday consists in making to-day potential in yesterday; and we deduce to-day from yesterday simply because we have provided for to-day in yesterday. Yesterday, then, was not unrelated to to-day, and was merely the antecedent stage of to-day; and yesterday in advancing to to-day has not risen above itself, but has only manifested its own potentialities. We may, indeed, make the motions of explain-

ing, and may refer to-day to yesterday in a general way and without thinking of what the explanation implies; but when we take the matter in earnest and pass from the generalities of verbal thinking to the exactness of concrete thinking we see that yesterday explains to-day only as it potentially contains it even to its minutest detail.

But what is true of yesterday is true of all previous days. Hence, in reasoning backward from the present, if our thought is complete and does not lose itself in the unreal simplifications of verbal thinking, we must always carry the present with us; and however far back we may go we must always find the present potentially there. Wherever in the past we make a cross section of the cosmic flow we find an order which implies the present and the future and which can be fully defined only in terms of its implications. If we come to a nebula it is not any and every sort of nebula, but one in which life and history and civilization are latent. If we come to atoms and molecules, these too already have such laws and relations that they are restricted to the actual order to the exclusion of any other. They are confined to given combinations and to given masses and distances and movements. They are also under the necessity of running into actual organic forms and exclude all others. Now, plainly, we never reach any original simplicity and indeterminateness along this road. We never get clear of the necessity of making the present facts potential in their antecedents; and the only development possible is not from nothing to something, but from potentiality to actuality. In such a system there is no rising above itself, no introduction of something essentially new. The actual has always been potential since the beginning; and if there was no beginning, then everything is, either potentially or actually, from everlasting. In that case our explanation or deduction consists in first potentializing the actual and then actualizing the potential. So far as there is any thought, in distinction from words, it moves in a circle.

From the complex, then, we cannot reach the simple; conversely, from the simple we cannot reach the complex. Simple existence which is purely such contains no ground of movement or direction and refuses to stir at all. Not until we put movement, direction, heterogeneity into it do we succeed in getting them out, and then only in the measure in which we put them in.

Or if we assume a cause with a definite nature, *A*, we can explain no effects which are not of like nature with *A*. Elements whose nature is fully expressed in gravity cannot be used to explain anything beyond gravitation. Elements endowed only with moving forces can explain nothing which is not an instance of motion. This is simply a matter of definition. To get more out of the cause we must assume that *A* does not fully express its nature, and that along with *A* is another factor, *X*, which is the true ground of the progress. If we attribute to matter effects which it has been supposed unable to produce, that does not prove that matter, as previously conceived, was adequate to these effects, but rather that we have been thinking too meanly of matter, and that we must enlarge our conception to include the new effects. Thus again it appears that there is no way of deducing effects from causes which do not implicitly contain them, and that our thought of the causes has to be determined so as to include the effects. All the complexity and peculiarity of the effects must be provided for in the causes, if they are to be the causes of those effects. The present, then, grows out of the past only on condition of being in the past. The high grows out of the low only as it is implicit in the low. The homogeneous which is to develop into the heterogeneous must itself be implicitly heterogeneous from the start. The heterogeneity which appears in the development is not something essentially new, but only a manifestation of what has always been implicit. Deny any of these conditions, and thought comes to a standstill.

The notion of potentiality with which we have been operating is itself highly obscure. It is a mental device for escaping the difficulties of a groundless becoming and for providing some foundation for the present in the past. The only clear conception we can form identifies potentiality with freedom; but we are seldom willing to go this length. Sometimes we think it sufficient to say that potentiality means only that under certain conditions certain events happen; but unless we are willing to accept the doctrine of absolute becoming we really mean more than this. We mean that the conditions contain the ground or reason why the event happens and why it must happen. At the same time we are utterly unable to form the least conception of what an ontological potentiality might be, or in what

its being would be distinguished from the being of an actuality. If the potentiality be nothing actual it can have no influence upon the actual; and if it be actual, what happens when it becomes that other actual which we distinguish from the potential? If we fall back upon the law we merely re-name the problem or abandon it. If we hold to a groundless becoming, then nothing is because any other thing is or has been, and everything is reduced to an opaque and groundless fact. With this conclusion all science and philosophy vanish, the theory of evolution among the rest.

We return from this rather bootless excursion into the obscurities of metaphysics to point out once more that the only antithesis in a system of necessary causation is that of implicit and explicit, and the only evolution possible is a passage from the implicit implication to the explicit manifestation. The potential plus the actual remains a constant quantity; and so far as final explanation is concerned our thought only oscillates between the two without any real progress. The notion of a primal meaningless simplicity, which was once nothing to speak of and yet the sufficient source of all things, is a pure fiction which can be neither reached nor used without bad logic. And, on the other hand, an evolution which gets effects out of causes only by making them potential in their causes does not seem very progressive. Plainly, we must choose between causes unrelated to their effects or causes which imply them. In the former case the explanation is absurd; in the latter we do not solve the problem, but only relocate it. Any final explanation must either move in a circle or appeal to intelligence as the only true explanation of anything.

The cause of this oversight is not far to seek. There is, first, a failure to master the notion and significance of law; and hence arises the fancy that a material and mechanical system might in a long time, by happy chances and runs of luck, hit upon results which would be mere accidents and yet look like the work of intelligence. In the next place, simplicity for the senses is mistaken for simplicity for the reason. When, then, we trace the present order of manifestation to an apparently simpler state, we forget that the simplicity is only in appearance, and that reason is compelled to find implicit in the underlying reality all the complexity which is yet to become explicit.

A specification of the same error is the fancy that a thing can be completely and exhaustively defined by its sense phenomena at any stage, and especially in its earliest stages, and without any reference to its law of development. What first appeared was the true and complete thing; what appeared later on was somehow evolved and adventitious, and in no way belonged to the proper nature of the thing. This is an illusion of minds which live in the senses. The potentialities and the law of a thing, however, belong to a proper notion of it. Two germs might look alike and yet be very different because of different laws of growth. Indeed, we are often told with an air, as if it were immensely significant, that the embryos of different animals are often indistinguishable, in complete unconsciousness of the fact (1) that all the more we must affirm an essential law of development, different in each, to explain the different product, and (2) that this law is the very gist of the matter.

Finally, there is a tendency in all uncritical thinking to mistake words for things, and especially to mistake the unity, simplicity, and identity of the word for the unity, simplicity, and identity of the things which the word denotes. In dealing with a plurality of things the mind is forced to use class terms, and thus one word comes to stand for many objects. In discussions like the present we use many terms of the highest abstraction, as matter, force, motion, etc. These, like all class terms, are only logical symbols, but they are promptly mistaken for things; and as all the definite determinations of concrete existence have disappeared from them we fancy that we have come upon the original, simple, homogeneous existence from which concrete realities have been derived. Among the class terms themselves we have the antithesis of simple and complex, indefinite and definite; and these logical relations are taken without suspicion as a copy of the true order of reality. The symbolic character of our general terms is overlooked, and their simplicity is allowed to hide the complexity of concrete existence. If we are asked what truly is, we think it sufficient to reply, say, matter, thus replacing reality by a logical abstraction and ignoring the complexity and multiplicity of the physical elements with their various laws and multitudinous relations. Thus the problem receives an unreal simplification, and the conditions of logical illusion are provided. This mistaking

of general terms and logical relations for real things and relations, which may be called the fallacy of the universal, is structural to the human mind until it has been purified by critical reflection.

This does not imply that verbal thinking and its simplifications have no practical value; on the contrary, they have a most important logical function and are of the utmost convenience in reducing knowledge to a compact and portable form. Very often we need to consider some single aspect of a body of facts; and a term which abstracts that aspect and unites the facts does thought a great service. Of course it no longer fully expresses the facts, but only a partial aspect of them. Yet its logical convenience may be great. Thus it is a useful generalization, from some points of view, to say that all the problems of physical science are problems of the distribution and redistribution of matter and motion. It simplifies our ideas and gives them a high degree of generality. But when it comes to the concrete facts we find them as complex and multiform as ever. There is no simple thing, matter, and no simple fact, motion, to be redistributed, but rather an indefinite number of moving things of various quality and quantity and in the most complex and mysterious dynamic relations, and moving, too, apparently, in the service of a system of ideas. When we pass to the concrete fact we see the difference between the logical symbol and the concrete reality; and we see also that logical simplification does not affect the reality at all. The former retains its value of logical convenience, but it is as little to be mistaken for the reality as man in general is to be mistaken for my next-door neighbor. Verbal thinking is convenient, but it is always abstract. Concrete thinking alone grasps reality, and it is compelled to carry all the complexity of the real into the conception, if it is to be adequate.

As an illustration of the way in which verbal thinking produces showy speculation nothing better can be found than Mr. Spencer's definitions of evolution. According to one definition, "Evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations." It is plain that this "homogeneity" is simply the last term of logical abstraction which has been mistaken for the first term of concrete existence.

We have already seen that, considered as a reality, it can be neither reached nor used. There is no motion or progress in it. We seem to get and use it, but it is only by verbal thinking. As we go backward in our abstraction we drop one after another of the concrete determinations of reality, and suppose that reality has dropped them also. Thus we reach the bare notion of undifferentiated homogeneity and mistake the notion for the fact. Then we turn around, and on our way back we pick up all we dropped before. Thus we deduce the heterogeneous from the homogeneous. Both processes are purely verbal.

Mr. Spencer has given a second definition of evolution for the sake, apparently, of bringing it into line with physical science. In this edition the definition runs: "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." We pass over the scientific scruples concerning this definition and point out that it is largely verbal and logical rather than concrete and real. Matter, a logical abstraction, takes the place of the physical elements, the realities in the case. But these elements are neither indefinite nor incoherent nor homogeneous. Each has its own definite qualities and is definitely related in a definite system of definite law. There is no incoherency in the real system and no progress toward greater coherency, except with reference to standards which we impose upon the system. If we take the solar system as a standard we may call the nebulous period incoherent. If we take a solid body as a standard we may call a gas incoherent. If we take the mature organism as a standard we may call the embryo incoherent. But in all these cases the incoherence is relative to an assumed standard, and is nonexistent for the underlying nature of things and the system of law. The homogeneity and heterogeneity, the coherence and incoherence, are relative to the speculator and his point of view. In reality they are but shadows of himself.

This long excursion into the domain of logic was undertaken to show the fictitious nature of popular evolutionary deductions, and also to lay bare the source of the illusion. The conclusion is that evolution, as a causal explanation, is a sorry affair, and that atheistic fumbling with evolution is all astray. Evolution

as scientific doctrine, without admixture of bad logic and bad metaphysics, leaves the argument for mind in nature just where it was before. If evolution is really a process from the simple to the complex it necessarily implies a causality beyond itself, and thus it becomes the successive manifestation of a power beyond the process. If, on the other hand, we insist on working the process by mechanical causes or "resident forces," there is no escape from making the original potentialities of the system include all later actualities, and thus there is no essential progress. In either case the teleological aspect of things remains untouched. The fancy that teleology is concerned rests upon an obsolete philosophy and upon the psychological limitation of the average mind, which make it hard to see purpose where it is slowly realized, and which, therefore, lead to the notion that in some obscure way time might do the work of intelligence; hence, as we have said before, the desire to limit progress to infinitesimal increments, the underlying fancy being that matter might well be equal to small improvements on its own account, and that these, when integrated by time, might amount to any desired sum. When the notion of law is mastered these whimsies disappear. If the rate of realization is to affect the argument an ephemeron might deny purpose in any human activity because it is so slowly realized.

There is, then, evolution and evolution. There is not the slightest occasion for taking offense at evolution in the scientific sense. No theist, no Christian even, can have any interest in maintaining any one conception of the creative method rather than any other. His interest is exhausted in maintaining that, whatever the method, God is the ultimate cause and source of all things. What we think of evolution as a philosophy is already sufficiently manifest.

The present paper has dealt only with the general idea of evolution. A second paper will treat of evolution in the organic and mental world; for in that realm especially popular thought has confused itself by failing to distinguish between the facts and mistaken interpretations.

Borden P. Bowne.

ART. II.—TURANIAN BLOOD IN THE ANGLO-SAXON RACE.

THE people of Europe and America are greatly mixed in blood. There are no pure races among them. More and more does scientific research find that varied strains of blood are in each of the great races, the Celtic, Teutonic, Anglo-Saxon, and the like. The assumption of pure blood, whether on Beacon Hill, among the Pennsylvania Quakers, or by the titled aristocracy of the Old World, is a figment of fancy. The terrible leveling of the French Revolution had its basis partly in blood, as well as in the loudly proclaimed rights of man. No one among the Western nations, no matter how pure he may think his Aryan blood is, can at all be certain but that he has an infusion of Turanian blood. If the human family is divided into the three commonly acknowledged races, the descendants of Ham, Japheth, and Shem, these three great divisions can by no means be claimed to have remained distinct in all the world's course, but have become more or less mixed. Each of them may represent some grouping of peculiarities in physical, mental, social, linguistic, or spiritual characteristics, but nothing more. Man is one species. The Semites have always been more exclusive than the other races; but the former two, from their wider distribution, greater populousness, interconquest, as well as characteristic tendencies, have at times and places been greatly amalgamated.

Among ethnologists and antiquarians it is generally conceded that the peoples inhabiting most parts of western and southern Europe before the incoming of the Celts and Teutons were those called Turanians. They were of small stature, their bones dug from the tumuli averaging five feet four and a half inches for the man, with much less stature for the woman. The tallest man thus found was five feet six inches. Historians, the most ancient, in describing them speak of their dark complexion. Even before historic times, when in various parts of Europe they lived in caves and buried their dead in long tumuli, they varied so much as to represent two classes of skulls, the round heads and the long heads. Ethnologists measure *crania* by making a proportion between the length

from the forehead backward and their greatest width. Heads with the width more than eighty to the length rated as one hundred are called broad heads, and less than eighty, long heads. Some European writers apply the names Iberian, Ligurian, and various other terms to these people. Their exhumed skeletons show them to have had a muscular development much too large for their slender bones, indicating a life of hardship and struggles. There is a marked disproportion between the size of the man and woman, showing that the latter, being the weaker, was overworked and starvingly fed. They seem not to have known the art of weaving cloth, but attired themselves in skins. If they had any domesticated animals these were few and of little importance.

These people, of whom we are getting more and more knowledge, though fragmentary at the best, were not exterminated by the conquering Celts, the first Aryan wave to overrun Europe, any more than the Celts were exterminated by the later wave of dominating Teutons. But this weak race was reduced to a servile condition, later becoming the peasants and toilers for the stronger and richer conquerors. If not submitting to such conditions they retained only a semblance of autonomy by retreating among the protecting hills and mountains, to the deep forests and out-of-the-way nooks and corners of the land. At the dawn of written history such is their varied condition. As civilization in western Europe advanced the condition of these downtrodden people became somewhat improved. As always happens under similar circumstances, the sharp prejudices of race gradually abated; marriages must have taken place between them and their conquerors, as well as other intermixture, and so the servile race was the gainer in condition and standing.

It is again conceded by scholars that the Aryans of Europe were tall, large men, with light complexion. In general this applies to the Celt, Teuton, and Slav. When the Romans came into contact with the Celts they were astounded at their size. Cæsar speaks of their huge, muscular bodies. Some young men of an old British tribe, on going to Rome, were found to be six inches taller than any one in that city. They had red or yellow hair, with blue or blue-gray eyes. Strabo says the Germans resembled the Gauls, but were taller, more savage, and of

more sandy complexion. But in Great Britain and on the Continent there have always been very many dark-complexioned people, and this type now exists in localities. In certain parts of France, as Brittany, in southern Scandinavia and south Germany, in Switzerland, the Walloon districts, and as far south as Bologna, and in other continental regions this is clearly seen; and this dark complexion and short stature are attributed by ethnologists to an infusion of Turanian blood. In Great Britain the same is true. Villages, districts, and restricted neighborhoods have a predominance of dark-complexioned people plainly not of Celtic or Teutonic blood.

There, as on the Continent, the peculiar, dark, swarthy complexion most commonly goes with low stature. There is but one inference possible, and that is that these people are the descendants of the old race found in those countries when the Celts and Teutons came there. In spite of conquest and their unfortunate debasement they have persisted to our own time, some in practically pure blood, and others in every grade of intermixture with their Aryan conquerors. They are found most nearly pure-blooded in Lancashire, in part of Wales, as in Denbighshire, and in Ireland in the counties of Down and Antrim, as well as along the banks of the Shannon. The poet Spenser, when a government officer in Ireland, wrote that the old races of the country had transmitted to the people of his time old customs of marrying, burying, dancing, singing, feasting, and cursing. They are found quite pure-blooded in some of the Scotch clans of Highlanders, as the Frazers, in Kintyre and Lorn, and on the Western Isles. When in Edinburgh we noticed a large number of small, dark-eyed people; and, having a notion that everybody in Scotland was Scotch—tall and light-eyed—we were at a loss to account for so many of an opposite description. On asking one living in the city we were told that all whom we saw were indeed Scotch, but that the two types were common, the tall, light-complexioned people and the small, dark ones. That terrible fighter, Rob Roy, is said to have been a short, dark man.

The earliest notices of Great Britain by historians yield indication of their presence. Tacitus, in his *Agricola*, speaks of the dark complexion and curly hair of the Silures, and, as Spain was the country opposite their location, makes the mistake of

thinking them immigrants from that country. Herodotus, long before that time, doubtless referred to them, calling them Kynetes, who, he says, lived to the west of the Celts, the most westerly people save these. He does not describe them. When the Romans occupied Britain they found these people, under various names, to be most resolute antagonists and assailants. With all the reputed fighting quality of the Gauls and Britons the Romans found the Silures of such greater warlike capacity that they attempted in vain to extinguish their very name. The Silures sometimes compelled the Roman generals to treat with them; if defeated they returned to the attack with unbroken spirit. The loss of leaders did not cause them to despair. Giraldus Cambrensis, a writer of the twelfth century, in describing the people of Monmouthshire says they were more accustomed to war, more famous for valor, and more expert in archery than those of the other parts of England. One of their tribes, under the name of Atticotti, as well as the Picts, were those from whom the Roman empire in the west was wont to recruit some of its choicest legions; two regiments of the former were enrolled among the Honoraries, the most distinguished troops of the imperial armies. When Rome withdrew from Britain the Picts and Scots were the successful assailants of the more civilized Britons, and the stout Jutes of Hengist and Horsa were hired to fight them.

As the native historians began chronicling passing events this race appears before us. Bede tells of them in his *History*. To the Picts of northern Scotland Columba went as a missionary; and their king, Brude, on being converted became a staunch supporter of the new faith. Their own chronicles tell of their acceptance of Christianity as taught by the Irish missionaries. Their language seems to have died out by the eleventh or twelfth century, though many Scotch words are doubtless borrowed from them. In 685 an army of them met Egfrith, King of Northumbria, at a place north of Edinburgh, and, terrific fighters as they always were, beat him and annihilated his army. For a hundred years in the north of Scotland they played an important part in national matters, holding many of the petty kings in subjection, fighting, now among themselves, now against the Scots and Angles. The considerable kingdom of Scone was theirs, and the famous stone of Scone

owes its fabled powers to their superstitions. Finally, the Norsemen, coming into Britain, broke the power of the Picts, and the latter were crowded back northward until the section of Moray was their only stronghold.

They had customs which were non-Aryan. One of these was the descent of the crown or other hereditary claim on the side of the woman instead of that of the man. This is a Turanian custom, and comes from their low marital habits, so that there was greater certainty of the descent being known on the mother's side. Certain strange and disgusting customs existed among them to historical times. To pledge each other they drank each other's blood, as African tribes now do. Giraldus mentions certain ecstatic actions among the Silures. The cursing of wells was known among them in Denbighshire. Names non-Aryan have survived in their localities. The sin-eater, who continued till our own time in Wales, has a duplicate among the Turkestan Turanians. Ancestral worship, the giving of the ancestral home to the youngest son and daughter, passing the drinking cup to the newborn babe through the fire, and other strange customs prevailing among the peasants of Great Britain are all non-Aryan.

In the traditions among the inhabitants of various sections of Great Britain these Turanian folk have largely figured. The Firbolgs of Irish legends, about whom strange things were asserted by historians not very remote, were doubtless these people. It is probable that these small, dark men, driven out of the pale of the Celts, hiding in the woods and caves, were often the originals of the numberless legends that have been preserved to modern times about the brownies, nixes, fairies, trolls, and dwarfs. As adepts in metallurgy they were represented in the legend of the Nibelungen Hoard by the brown-faced, small-statured Mimer. Addicted to magic, they became the terror of old wives, nursery maids, and naughty children. Stories like the following can be traced to them: In a certain place, if a horse, having lost a shoe, was left with a present, in due time it would be found at the same spot, safe and well shod; at another spot food left would be missing and money found instead; in Belgium if a broken metal vessel was put at a certain spot, with cakes, of which these men seemed very fond, the cakes would be gone but the vessel nicely mended.

Down to modern times these people have retained characteristics and peculiarities of their own. An Irish writer, two hundred years ago, speaking of them in his country, describes them as "the black-haired, mischievous, tale-bearing, un hospitable churls, disturbers of assemblies, who love not music or entertainment." The lordly Celts in that country retained the right of increasing at their pleasure the rent of these men, who were easily distinguished from the Milesians by their jet-black hair and small stature. In Scotland and the Western Isles these same people were represented but shortly ago as having "a strange foreign look"—"dark-skinned, dark-haired, dark-eyed, and small stature." From their dark complexion they were called children of the night. At Barra, Scotland, the features of one girl reminded a certain writer of the Nineveh sculptures. Before us as we write lies a photograph of a group of Shetland Island women. They are of the working class, the peasants. In their build they are short and stocky, with heavy black hair, large dark eyes, wide across the cheeks, with low foreheads and round heads. They are plainly a group of Turanians.

In his *Origins of English History* Mr. Charles Elton says :

Our principal ancestors no doubt came late from the shores and flats between the Rhine and the Gulf of Bothnia. But the English nation is compounded of the blood of many different races ; and we might claim a personal interest not only in the Gaelic and Belgic tribes who struggled with the Roman legions, but even in the first cave-men who sought their prey by the slowly receding ice fields, and the many forgotten people whose relics are explored in sites of lake villages, or seaside refuse heaps, or in the funeral mounds, or whose memory is barely preserved in the names of mountains and rivers. For it is hardly possible that a race should ever be quite exterminated or extinguished. The blood of conquerors must in time become mixed with that of the conquered. The preservation of men for slaves and the women for wives will always insure the continued existence of the inferior race, however much it may lose of its original appearance, manners, or language.

Archæologists now argue that physical characteristics are the most persistent marks of a race. Language is unreliable for that purpose, since it is well known that totally different races have spoken the same tongue. If language could be fully depended upon ethnologists in the distant future might class the Negroes of the South and the New England Yankees in the

same race, since both write and speak the same language. After physical characteristics, as facilitating racial identification, come habits and customs, which are usually very persistent; then also myths and traditions. While the Turanians of western Europe have wholly lost their languages, unless that of the Basques is an aboriginal fragment, their physical characteristics, mental traits, myths, and customs still distinguish them. They seem originally to have been highly vivacious, brave, persistent, and not easily cowed. As their surroundings improved they became skillful workers in metals, and likewise dealt in the black art. Holding superstitious and credulous notions themselves, they were able to impress in some degree upon their Aryan neighbors notions of the same kind.

Their influence upon people with whom they have mixed cannot be fully known; but some salient points may be distinguished. It is the opinion of Professor Rhys that the lively humor and ready wit of the Irish may have their source in the vivacious temperament of this people, since a large element of Irish blood is Turanian. Similar traits in the Welsh may be traced to the same source. It is probable that their blood has entered more abundantly into the French than into any other western nation. How much the characteristics of temperament, literary taste, fighting qualities, habits, and customs that mark the French people are traceable to Turanian blood cannot be definitely determined, but doubtless it is important. The pure Celts, who were the original stock of Gauls, were too much of the same race with the heavy, stolid Teutons to be very vivacious. But the old mixture with those earlier peoples doubtless accounts for many of the characteristics, both physical and mental, usually considered peculiarly French. Napoleon's strange career may have been made possible only by the Turanian blood in the French nation.

In America it is said that blondes are dying out. But blondes show Celtic and Teutonic blood. The northern nations of Europe, as the Danes, Scandinavians, and Germans, are predominantly of this type. One going from France to Sweden or Germany is conscious of going to people that are of lighter complexion and larger form. Immigrants to the United States from those countries are noticeable by their tendency toward the blonde type. They are less marked with the dark blood of

the Turanians than the British, the French, Italians, or peoples from eastern Europe. The great migration setting so remarkably toward our country brings from Europe the extremes of blonde and swarthy people.

Ethnology and history combine in showing that the best peoples in the world's progress have been those of mixed races. Back as far as old Egypt and Assyria this is noticeable. Even the Chinese are made up of different races, and the same is true of the Japanese. India's teeming millions are compounded of the three great divisions of the human family, Hamitic, Japhetic, and Semitic, and these are more or less mixed, in spite of their rigid caste and religious prejudices. In the English people there is, as we have shown, quite a current of Turanian blood; then Celtic, Belgic, Anglo-Saxon, Norseman, and Norman-French elements are all component parts of the mighty British nation. In our country the purpose of Providence may be to produce a magnificent American race that shall embody such a wise adjustment of diverse characteristics that for the purposes of present and future national development it will prove the best the world has ever yet seen. Here, too, for the first time in more than two thousand years in the western world, the Turanian finds opportunities for even chances with other races. Not in the servile condition of slave, serf, peasant, or retainer does he stand, but as a man, with the field freely and widely open before him.

From two sources the Turanian race has entered the United States and has become an important element in our national structure: first, from the British and other peoples of western Europe among whom they have persisted and mixed; and, second, from the Canadian French. It has been shown in this study how the Turanians are represented among our parental ancestors, the English, Scotch, Irish, and Welsh people. If in those countries they were generally the peasants, operatives, crofters, kerns, they have had in this country an even chance, and are proving that the elements of success are not an inheritance of the Aryans only. It is said that Livingstone was a small, dark man from a Pictish locality in Scotland. Those who have looked upon Henry M. Stanley and seen his short, stocky build, beetling shoulders, and terrible eye, by which he swayed the wild soldiers and carriers of central Africa, and

then remember that he was from an obscure family in the very Denbighshire, Wales, where the remnants of this race are so distinctly observable, will be led to the conclusion that he, too, was of the brave, fiery, and restless Turanian race. The blood of Rob Roy, of Livingstone, of Stanley, and their compeers is not of inferior quality. In aristocratic Great Britain these people were not allowed full opportunities of development; in America, where rank and tradition stand for nothing, the swarthy-complexioned man has the same opportunities as the blonde. The vast deal of intermixture in Great Britain during the two thousand years of Celtic and Teutonic dominancy has been fully transmitted to America. Professor Huxley says of himself in this connection: "The combination of swarthinness with stature above the average and a long skull confers upon me the serene impartiality of a mongrel." These "mongrels" are found widely distributed both in Great Britain and the United States. Here, as there, this intermixture is ceasing to be rare or to attract notice.

The second source of Turanian blood in the United States is from the Canadian-French immigration. The characteristically small, dark, vivacious Frenchman unmistakably proves his Turanian blood. The notion prevalent years ago that this swarthinness was owing to intermixture with the redskins is now known to have little basis. Very few show the distinct features and traits of the American Indian. But the peasantry of Brittany and other French provinces where ancient Turanian elements survive were largely drawn upon to furnish Canada with settlers. They came, as Francis Parkman shows, not so spontaneously as the British settlers came to the thirteen colonies, but partly by forcible methods on the part of the king and lordly barons of the home country. Transplanted to the rich farming lands of the lower St. Lawrence, they developed, indeed, but more slowly than the colonists this side the line. Our better material prosperity and other considerations are attracting multitudes of them to eastern and northern United States. Here their vivacity, their hardihood, and prolific tendencies promise to make them an important factor in American life and structure. Possibly they come to introduce several elements lacking in the life of the Eastern States, which, among the descendants of the Puritans, threatens to become unproductive, chilling, and strait-laced.

We must recognize that Turanian traits still inhere in these Canadian immigrants. Their old tendency to magic and superstition inclines them to accept and persistently retain the rather spectacular services of the Roman Catholic faith, while their long subserviency in Europe permits them to accept in unquestioning faith its authoritative oracles. The lightness of their spirit, in pleasing contrast to the rather heavy tendencies of our Puritanic and Teutonic traditions, can be deemed as introducing into American life a valuable element. They are slowly but surely amalgamating with the English race in the States. In process of time they will doubtless become an integral part of the American people.

In attending the closing exercises of two different schools last season, the one a fashionable boarding school for young ladies, the other a successful high-school in a manufacturing New England city in which there is a large French-Canadian population, we could not help noticing the marked contrast exhibited by the blonde and the dark-complexioned girls. In the fashionable school, to which had been sent, most presumably, girls from the old, wealthy families of New England, there was a preponderance of blondes, with light hair, light complexion, and rather tall, slim forms. In the high-school, of the hundred or more girls present, there was a much greater per cent of those having darker characteristics of hair, eyes, and complexion and with shorter and more sturdy forms.

M. V. B. Knox.

ART. III.—PRAYER.

PRAYER is unquestionably a theme of no little complexity, as well as of paramount importance. While there is much that is clear about it there is also much that is obscure. That prayer is both a duty and a privilege, having to do with all people, places; times, and topics; that the spirit of prayer is an essential part of the spirit of a Christian; that prayer, though a power, is not dictation or demand, and was never intended to give us mortals independent control of the universe, is generally acknowledged and perhaps sufficiently understood. But the best use of prayer as a means of personal growth, its practical efficacy in securing desired results, its essential limitations, specific conditions, and wide-reaching ramifications in everyday experience—these are matters on which there is much diversity of opinion and pressing need of profound reflection. For lack of such reflection the wildest notions have too often gained currency.

Prayer has always been a specially fertile field for superstition on the one hand and for skepticism on the other. Like the doctrine of providence which underlies it, the doctrine of prayer so involves the close interaction of God and man, so necessitates a careful discrimination between the respective provinces of the divine and the human, that confused or erroneous views are both very plentiful and very harmful. The doctrine of prayer touches our creed, and the practice of prayer our character, at a hundred points. How prolific, then, of evil every misapprehension in this matter! How productive of good everything which aids to put the subject on a firm foundation of intelligent thought! To pray well it is not necessary to study little, nor is ignorance the mother of devotion. True religion will be helped, not hindered, by such a statement of its underlying principles as shall conform to the most rigorous requirements of theological and philosophical investigation. As one of the essential preliminaries for the construction of such a statement—premising that in this whole discussion we omit, for lack of space, all treatment of prayer in its wide sense of worship or communion with God and restrict ourselves to prayer as petition—we proceed to inquire, What is the office or purpose of prayer?

The purpose of prayer is not to inform the Omniscient ; for he perfectly knows both what things we really need and what things we foolishly desire without our uttering a word. It is not to soften into tenderness, by pitiful pleading, an austere master ; for he is the God of boundless love, from whose infinite mercy ceaseless blessings flow, and who is far more willing to give than we are to ask. It is not to induce the wise Ruler of the universe to change his beneficent, eternal plans, unsettling the established course of nature and disturbing the constancy of law to gratify our childish whims. It is not to indulge our laziness by the substitution of begging for working and idle petitioning for the painstaking use of the appointed means of gain. Nor yet is it any part of the purpose of prayer to make us careless about strict compliance with God's precepts by encouraging the idea that the wisely ordered, indispensable penalties for disobedience will be readily set aside in response to our request.

These points are almost self-evident. They do not need elaborate amplification or vindication. Few, if any, would attempt to maintain their contrary. Nevertheless, in their practical application they are constantly forgotten, and from that forgetfulness no little harm arises. The false views of God which are often inculcated or implied in the prayers do much to neutralize the more correct teachings of the sermons. It is extremely easy and extremely evil to give the impression, when we pray, that God is very ignorant, or very hard-hearted, or very fickle, and that one set of his enactments contradicts another. Many forget that he reveals his will in nature and by providence quite as decidedly as in Scripture and by his Spirit ; and our prayers should no more run counter to the former than to the latter. The due observance of his laws and the faithful employment of the common sense provided for our guidance he certainly expects from all his creatures. Willful or careless neglect in either of these directions, under the mistaken idea that we are more fully honoring him by relying solely on prayer and faith, is a delusion never to be fostered, but always to be rebuked.

Many other delusions will be removed and many obscurities in this theme cleared up by keeping steadily in mind the precise purpose or object of prayer. We have seen what it is not. We

now ask what it is. Dr. James Buchanan, of Edinburgh, in his *Modern Atheism*, page 289, says:

The object of prayer is to acknowledge God's dominion and our dependence, and to obtain from him in the way of his own appointment the blessings of which we stand in need.

This is well expressed. It will tend, however, to greater clearness of thought if we distinguish more definitely between the immediate and the ultimate object of prayer. Manifestly there are two ends effected by it. It not only procures many specific things, and so satisfies our immediate need, but it also has a most important influence on the moral and religious development of our character. This latter must be regarded, we think, as the predominant purpose in the institution of prayer, the former being kept strictly subordinate. In other words, special petitions for things which would retard religious growth are not encouraged or granted; and the qualities which are most of all essential to religious growth, such as reverence, sincerity, simplicity, humility, benevolence, obedience, perseverance, gratitude, and faith, are precisely those which condition and control effectual prayer.

It is very instructive to note in this connection the close analogy, as regards purpose or design, between prayer and all other forms of human effort. The cultivation of the earth, for instance, has for its immediate object the production of crops for the satisfaction of our physical wants. But the necessary food supply, it is evident, might have been procured by easier methods, as it was in the garden of Eden, were it not that the severe toil now requisite has the further and more important design of aiding us to subdue the flesh and become fit for heaven. The ultimate object, moral discipline, is the governing one in agriculture as well as in prayer. And it must be so in every department, since the whole of life is a training school for the hereafter. So, too, we can see that prayer has precisely the same efficiency for procuring its immediate object as every other means which God has seen fit to connect with the attainment of specific ends. Look, again, at the cultivation of the earth. If we did not plow and sow and reap we would have no wheat. Yet it is none other than God who gives us our daily bread, and our labor in procuring it does not

change his purpose at all or make him any kinder toward us. Nevertheless, it remains true that if we work we get food, and if we do not work we do not get it. Our volitions in the matter furnish God the occasion to put forth the action which he would not otherwise have done, which action results in our having the food we wished. It is exactly the same with prayer. Things come to us because we pray. They would not come if we did not pray. Yet it is God who gives them as he sees fit. They are the fruit of his ever-watchful love, and their bestowment involves not the slightest alteration in the eternal counsels of his will.

There is no more difficulty in the adjustment of prayer to the scheme of providence than in the adjustment of any other form of human volition or endeavor. In other words, there is no difficulty at all, if God's immanence in nature be properly grasped and we discard from our conception of him the limitations as to time and power which pertain only to finite beings. Nature is not a machine, having an existence apart from God though subject to his control. God does not stand outside of the world as an engineer stands outside his engine, manipulating, adjusting, and repairing. He is the indwelling Spirit, vitalizing all and energizing all from within them. There are no forces in the external universe external to God, which he originally set in motion and now has to modify or arrange, as we from time to time interpose our wishes and wills. Nature, rightly viewed, is but another name for one of the manifestations of God, and the laws of nature are but the constant action of his all-pervading, all-sustaining will. To say, therefore, that our prayers require no changes in nature is the same as to say they require no changes in God. As Bushnell has put it:

God can never once make a new purpose in time, because he can never meet a new case which had not already come into knowledge and had its merits discovered and its allotments determined.

His purposes were made from eternity, made with full knowledge of all the prayers that would be offered and with special adaptation to them. These prayers were as present to God in the beginning as they are at the moment when they find utterance on human lips, and they prevailed with him then.

so that his purposes were made with express reference to answering them.

To think or say that this makes prayer any the less effective, or tends in any way to belittle the power of prayer, is simply to betray weakness of understanding and confusion of thought. For the foreknowledge of God has no causative effect on free human actions, nor can it detract in the least from the preciousness of the gift; rather does it add, that it was so long beforehand prepared for us.

There is no lack of high authorities who consider this theory of prearranged harmony between prayer and its answer as by far the most satisfactory of any yet proposed. To mention only a few out of very many, Dr. McCosh, in his *Method of Divine Government*, says:

God does not require to interfere with his own arrangements in order to answer prayer, for there is an answer provided in the arrangements which he had made from all eternity. The answer to prayer proceeds on the foreseen circumstance that the prayer will be offered, and if a man refuses to pray he will assuredly find it fixed that no answer is given.

Dr. Buchanan, after emphatically indorsing this theory of prayer, adds that

It is a solution which has obtained the sanction of some of the highest names in science and theology.

The distinguished German mathematician, Euler, writes:

When God established the course of the universe and arranged all the events that must come to pass in it he paid attention to all the circumstances which should accompany each event, and particularly to the dispositions, desires, and prayers of every intelligent being; and the arrangement of all events was disposed in perfect harmony with all these circumstances. When, therefore, a man addresses to God a prayer worthy to be heard, that prayer was already heard from all eternity; and the Father of mercies arranged the world expressly in favor of that prayer, so that the accomplishment should be a consequence of the natural course of events. It is thus that God answers the prayers of men without working a miracle.

So says Dr. William W. Patton in his *Prayer and its Remarkable Answers*. And so say most of those best qualified to lead theological thought.

Can any valid or important objection be brought against this theory? We know of none. It certainly does not detract

in the least from the thorough objective efficiency of prayer. It gives plenty of play for utmost freedom in supplication, while at the same time protecting God's unincumbered reign. Our petitions do really affect him and prevail with him as genuinely as when we pray to men. Nor does it make him a whit the less tender and fatherly because he foresees our wants and provides that when we present them to him their supply will be ready. The fact that he fills all time and has always been as present with what we call *now* as at the given moment when we reach it, even as one from a sufficient elevation sees the whole course of a river, should not be so very difficult to grasp, and when grasped puts the whole subject on an intelligible basis. It enables us to see how—although God is immutable, "The Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning," never taken by surprise, or needing to modify any of his arrangements—the prayer that we freely offer has, all the same, a genuine influence in shaping the course of events. Two well-known lines of a standard Christian hymn,

Prayer is appointed to convey
The blessings God designs to give,

express with great accuracy the fundamental truth in the philosophy of this subject. Strictly speaking, "There is no power but of God;" and prayer is not a power in itself, but only a means of putting us in connection with the power, a channel for its conveyance to certain ends. The power does not inhere in us, nor can we convey it or use it as we please. Our part is to ascertain what God's will is, and then to offer our petitions in exact accord therewith.

It is in view of this fact that we are able to say that no true prayers are ever unanswered or unsuccessful. For by a true prayer must be meant one offered in accordance with the laws governing this department of God's kingdom, that is, one offered for things "according to his will," since only in that case does he hear us (1 John v, 14). There is a vast amount of praying breath spent in vain, if by praying be meant the going through the form of prayer; but if real praying be intended, then there is nothing vain about it. Whole hours or days of merely formal prayer are worse than worthless, while a single moment of real prayer accomplishes wonders. If we ask and

receive not it is surely because we ask amiss, in defiance or disdain of the specified conditions. When prayer is actually without answer it is simply because the person only seems to pray, although a prayer may seem to be without answer when a person actually prays. If it be said that the specific things requested do not always come, the reply is that no genuine child of God makes a request in a case where he has no positive knowledge of the divine will, without explicitly or implicitly asking God to withhold if he does not see best to grant. Submissiveness is an essential part of all true prayer; and the success of the prayer is assured when it accomplishes the ultimate object of the exercise, that is, the development of religious character, even though the immediate object be not reached.

It should be noted also that answers to prayer are just as real when they come in the common course of providence, with nothing striking or extraordinary about them, nothing that makes the connection so direct and unmistakable as to defy denial. The answers in such a case may be just as precious to the believer, although without definite apologetic value to repel the doubts of the skeptic. Should not the Christian's whole life be accounted a succession of answers to his prayers? Our prayers, "uttered or unexpressed," cover all our needs, and whatsoever comes in the ordinary course of nature to supply those needs comes from Him of whose unchanging will nature is but the expression. The difference in results to him who prays and to him who does not pray is often found in the inward rather than the outward realm. God gives certain external material things to those by whom no prayer is offered; he sends his rain "on the just and on the unjust;" but the most valuable gifts, those which satisfy the heart, come only in response to sincere petitions.

It is sometimes said that we should ask God for everything we want. But this depends both on what we want and how we ask. Our wants should be duly scrutinized and kept in proper bounds, and we must ask in different ways for different classes of things. There are things for which no one should ever ask. Where God has in any way declared his will to be positively adverse to our desires on a particular point it would be an impertinence or a disobedience to present or to cherish those desires. Where we are sure that a certain thing will come to pass without our

praying, that it is not conditioned at all on our asking, that God's will is fixed in the matter independently of anything we can say or do, we should not pray for it. Those phenomena of nature which we can absolutely predict, like an eclipse of the sun or the length of the day at different seasons, we feel have been taken out of the realm of prayer. Hence, just in proportion as people come to believe and feel that to-day's rain and sunshine have as fixed and far-reaching connections with the whole universe of matter from all eternity as do the movements of the heavenly bodies, they will cease to pray that the weather may be specially manipulated to suit their petty ephemeral projects of selfish pleasure or gain. Some things, then, cannot be made, intelligently and with any proper expectation of objective result, the subjects of petition. If we pray about them at all the prayer must be that we may have wisdom and strength to put ourselves in perfect harmony at that point with the unalterable will of the sovereign Ruler of heaven and earth. Such a prayer is a prayer simply for submission, and the alteration effected by it is wholly within ourselves. Many prayers are plainly of this sort. But those are undoubtedly much astray who claim that all prayer is merely subjective in its effects.

There are some things which everybody may ask for with absolute certainty of obtaining the swift accomplishment of his desires. We refer to those spiritual blessings which are distinctly promised to all who seek. The very seeking, if it be in the right spirit, is the only condition of the bestowment of the desired things. The condition being fulfilled, the result requested follows as the immediate, regular sequence. The change in the attitude of God toward us which we crave is strictly dependent on the prescribed change in our attitude toward him, and when we have done our part he does his without failure. Things of this sort, such as strength against temptation, counsel in difficulty, deliverance from evil, are fully covered by plain promises of unlimited application. God's will concerning them is fully known, and the power of him who truly prays to obtain these things is absolute. They will not come unless he prays; they will certainly come if he does pray. The connection between the prayer and the acquisition is direct and complete, as much so as that between sowing the crop and reaping the harvest.

There is another large class of subjects that can be asked for with absolute certainty of reception only by certain people at certain times. It includes all physical or temporal mercies, and such spiritual gifts as are not intended for universal and impartial distribution conditioned simply on the asking. Through the lack of a definite, unmistakable promise we are left in doubt, when a specific case of this sort arises, as to what the divine will concerning it may be. As a rule, the person asking for things of this class cannot be sure that his request will be granted. For example, a dear friend is ill. Now, it is plainly not God's will to heal all people, or even all good people under all circumstances, and there is manifestly no Bible promise which says that if we pray at this particular time for this particular person he shall be straightway healed. Relief from physical destitution or financial embarrassment comes under the same head. So, too, does extraordinary conviction for sin, whether sent upon a person and resulting in his individual conversion or sent upon a community and resulting in a general reformation. Such powerful special impressions by the Holy Spirit cannot, in the nature of the case, be constant or universal; and there is no promise that transfers from God to men the critical decision as to when and where this peculiar influence can most effectually be exerted. Being then in doubt, not as to the divine power or benevolence (which doubt would be a sin), but as to the divine will in this matter, it is clear that, however much we desire the thing in question, prayer has no absolute power to procure it, and we can ask for it with no assurance that it will come. We are not certain that the prayer is the sole condition of its coming. There may be a great many strong reasons why it cannot come which are wholly hidden from our sight. We may pray for it, since it is not a thing as yet denied or forbidden. We should pray for it, since prayer may be the one condition of its coming, and, if we fail to pray for it, we cannot be sure but that our failure to pray was the cause of our failure to receive; hence prayer is essential to that peace of mind which results from the feeling that we have done all we can. But the prayer must be with entire submission; must contain the proviso, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt;" must make full acknowledgment that God's beneficent, sovereign will in the

case, whether it meets our personal wishes or not, will be exactly best and right.

Such must be the position of most Christians always, and of all Christians most of the time. But, as already intimated, certain people can sometimes ask for even this class of things with absolute certainty of receiving just what they ask for. How is this done? By whom? When? By those who are delivered from all doubts as to the divine will. In other words, by those to whom God has given a direct, unmistakable intimation of his willingness to bestow, in response to petition, the special thing desired. This supplies that essential basis for their faith which otherwise they could not have. And it is clear that the gift which God bestows upon them is not, strictly speaking, the gift of faith, as it is commonly called, but the gift of knowledge of God's purpose, such as can be made a basis for the intelligent exercise of their faith. It has a close connection with the gift of prophecy, for it is really an announcement in advance by the Almighty of what he intends to do, a special revelation of the course he is about to pursue, the chief difference between this and ancient prophecies being that this is of private interpretation, being intended for the use and comfort of the individual only and having no special application to public or national affairs. The faith which these persons have is precisely the same as that possessed by others, namely, a belief that God will do as he says and will be true to his word. The difference in their case is that God has revealed something to them which he has not revealed to others. They have a special word, covering the particular matter in hand, directly conveyed to them by the Holy Spirit as the requisite evidence for their belief. Having received this word, it would be a sin in them not to believe it, just as it would be presumption in others to attempt to believe without the divinely given evidence.

Much is sometimes said as to the wonderful power of those prayers which are followed by exceptional or extraordinary answers. But we perceive, on reflection, that they are not different in this respect from other prayers whose answers contain nothing striking. Things come about because of the prayers which would not come about if the prayers were not offered, but the power is wholly of God in all cases. He never del-

gates his rule to any. He, and he only, decides as to the thing which he will do. He chooses according to his sovereign will some person through whose obedient faith the thing shall be brought to pass. The person is only a channel or an instrument for the efficiency of God. Why he chooses this one and not that for these special distinctions none can tell. There is no discernible principle on which these honors, if such they should be called, are distributed. Their recipients do not always excel others in piety or faithfulness, in fullness of love or of consecration; nor does the possession or exercise of these gifts imply a remarkable degree of grace in any direction. It may sometimes indicate extraordinary need; but as a rule we can only say that it is divinely or inexplicably bestowed, like other merely temporal distinctions, such as comeliness of person or pleasantness of surroundings in life. Its bestowal, it may be added, is none of our concern, provided we are conscious of diligently using whatever gifts we have and fully responding to all the grace offered us.

It may reasonably be doubted if it is well to covet earnestly this gift. Truly we little know what is best for us. It is evident that many make great mistakes in the matter, supposing they have the gift when they have not, or supposing they have it constantly when it is only an occasional thing. We see this frequently illustrated in each of the two chief forms of this extraordinary prophetic faith, namely, in the medical treatment of disease and in revivals—the healing of the body and the healing of the soul. Incontrovertible testimony in great abundance seems to show that healings of the body have taken place throughout the Christian ages, and do still take place, in connection with the exercise of this extraordinary faith. On the other hand, there have been cases where people attempted to exercise this faith, and thought they did so; but the expected results did not follow, and it was manifest that God had not authorized their endeavor. In the same way there have been many cases where both individual conversions and widespread revivals of religion have followed the exercise of this peculiar faith; while, on the other hand, there have been, perhaps, even more cases where the special prayer was offered and the conversion or revival was expected and even predicted with the utmost possible confidence; but it utterly failed to

come, showing that God had not spoken, and the over-eager prophet had run before he was sent. In view of these unquestionable facts we see the great need of caution on this point. Fanaticism and presumption lie very near to this faith. Since the only evidence for belief is a mysterious inward impression or feeling, extremely difficult to judge impartially and necessarily removed from the connecting influence of other people's judgments, it is easy to be mistaken about it; and persons of emotional or excitable temperaments, whose feelings are never under much control and who have little or no intellectual discipline, are very apt to run away with the notion that they have this special calling or gift. It is frequently a matter of mere fancy or ambition or self-will. We must try the spirits very thoroughly. There is little harm from overcaution and humility in this direction. There is great harm from rashness and overconfidence and from the disappointment that is certain to result. It would, perhaps, be a good rule for one not to attempt to exercise this faith if he could help it, that is, unless so exceedingly convinced of its necessity as to feel that he was committing sin by refusing to do so. The gift must be exceptional. It cannot be designed to replace other means, either in medical treatment or in revivals, but only to supplement them. God certainly intends us, as a rule, to observe the laws of health if we wish to keep well, and to use the natural remedies he has provided if we wish to get well. He intends religious effects to proceed generally from easily traceable natural causes. He will not do for us what we can do for ourselves. He will not encourage idleness nor put any sign of displeasure or inferiority on the use of the regular instrumentalities which he has ordained.

In the light of this discussion as to the purpose and philosophy of prayer it will be seen, we trust, that our prayers need very careful examination, and that certain expressions and practices often connected with them are open to grave objection. The mental and physical struggles sometimes occurring under the name of "agonizing prayer" or "wrestling with God," in which violent contortions of body and tempests of sound predominate, as though heaven were a fortress to be carried by storm, are scarcely defensible as prayer to the Almighty, though possibly having their place as a means of

affecting human hearers or ourselves. If intended to influence God they betray a very low conception of him, one wholly unworthy of the close of the nineteenth Christian century. The demand for importunity in prayer must be wholly from ourselves, and can only be of use in arousing us to a vigorous employment of the means prescribed for the attainment of our object, and in causing us to comply more strictly with the conditions of the promise.

Much that is not really prayer goes by that name. We hear elaborate descriptions, beautiful illustrations, learned arguments, eloquent rhapsodies, stirring exhortations, theological essays, embodying much information and even disputation, very convincing and effective for their purpose; but that purpose is surely not supplication, nor yet communion with God. Nor should our approaches to the All-Father and gracious Helper of mankind be overmuch taken up with worship, with liturgical rotundities and doxologies, as though we had everything to give and nothing to ask. "This *te deumizing* of God is like to be a tedium to him." It is more fitting that we come as little children, mainly with petitions for what we want.

Among other dangers to be guarded against in prayer may be concisely mentioned the following: Egotism and selfishness; consultation of our own personal interests and those of our immediate friends, without regard for the good of others and the general welfare; self-confidence and trust in our own judgment rather than in God's, leading to imperative and dictatorial requests for things in regard to which God has not made known his will; the mistaking of strong hope or intense desire for faith, thus reasoning ourselves into the conviction that a thing must needs be God's will because it is so much our own will; the confounding of disciplinary delays with positive denials, so that we become easily discouraged when God has simply postponed his answer for the sake of trying our faith and patience and humility; the formal or random use of words without reflection as to their meaning, thus making prayer a matter of routine rather than of religion; and the filling up of the time with cant phrases repeated parrotlike, instead of using newly coined expressions fresh from the heart and reverentially uttered. If these faults were corrected there would be less saying of prayers and more true praying.

The number of really unanswered prayers—that is, of so-called prayers, prayers that accomplish nothing either with God or with ourselves and are little better than a mockery, a delusion, a waste of time, and a loss of opportunity—we believe to be enormous. It is a shame and a sin. We should ask always in such a way that we may receive. The directions are explicit and not beyond comprehension or power of observance. They are embodied in five brief “whatsoever” verses which read as follows: “All things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive” (Matt. xxi, 22); “Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do” (John xiv, 13); “If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will, and it shall be done unto you” (John xv, 7); “Whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do the things that are pleasing in his sight” (1 John iii, 22); “If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us: and if we know that he heareth us whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions which we have asked of him” (1 John v, 14, 15). The meaning of these directions is, in brief, that we can secure the objects of our desires by completely uniting our will with the will of God. For then we shall have no trouble about believing God’s word. We shall ask only for such things as Christ would ask in our place. Christ will abide in us and we in him, and like Jesus we shall be able truthfully to say, “I do always the things that are pleasing to him,” and “I knew that thou hearest me always.”

James Mudge

ART. IV. — NOVALIS.*

AT Weissenfels, on the Saale, a score of miles from classic Weimar, in the midst of factories and tanneries, there was dedicated in 1872 a monument to the "ardent and holy Novalis"—Friedrich von Hardenberg—philosopher and poet, of whom, though more than ninety years have passed since he sank into that "calm sleep" from which no human voice can wake him, too little is known, especially in the United States and among those who desire insight into the mental and spiritual life of a pure-souled man of genius, who aspired to unite philosophy and religion and succeeded in developing a symmetrical character, combining simplicity of trust and depth of thought.

Thomas Carlyle, feverishly delving into German literature, discovered there two small volumes by "Novalis"—*Novalis Schriften herausgegeben von Fr. Schlegel und Ludwig Tieck*—and, painfully translating from them into English, wrote a famous essay, first announcing to English readers, half a century ago, that "few books known to us are more worthy of their attention," and describing them as "an unfathomed mine of philosophical ideas, where the keenest intellect may have occupation enough;" and it was for writing these two little books that the Germans erected the monument on the banks of the Saale. They do not constitute a very colossal or astonishing achievement, one may say, if only the quantity of literary product be considered, namely, a novel, fifteen spiritual songs, six miscellaneous poems, an unfinished romance, six "Hymns to the Night," and one hundred and eighty pages of "Fragments," or "Texts of Thought," on "Philosophy and Physics," "Æsthetics and Literature," and "Ethics." But even the quantity is remarkable when it is remembered that our author had been out of school only seven years when, in the early spring days of 1801, he died at Weissenfels, and that for the last five years of his short life (he was less than twenty-nine years old at the time of his death) he was engaged in active business pursuits, as auditor and assessor of the electoral salt mines in Thuringia. We cannot, therefore, judge him and his

* "Novalis is a figure of such importance in German literature that no student can pass him by without attention."—*Carlyle*.

works as we judge the great Goethe and his works; but we may accept that literary autocrat's opinion and, with him, believe that Novalis needed only time to make him a recognized leader of modern thought. "It is our loss," said Goethe, in 1808, "that he died so young, especially as he did his time the favor of becoming Catholic."

Novalis himself, unconscious that his career was so soon to terminate, did not regard his unpublished writings as the finished product of his pen, to be measured according to accepted canons of literary art, but rather as a journal or record of his mental life and an essential means of self-culture—studies, hints, and outlines to be subsequently developed by fuller research and deeper thinking. To some of them he gave the suggestive title of "Pollen"—not flowers, full blown in the sun, but the seed and germ of future bloom, collected, beelike, from great works in philosophy, fiction, theology, and poetry. Not that he was a mere pollen-bearer, transferring fructifying germs from the minds of master thinkers to his own infertile brain. His ministry of thought was richer than that; he produced the genial honey of a profound and suggestive philosophy, eclectic in its sources, but homogeneous in its synthesis. He was a cosmopolite in the domains of reason, a disciple of no master, a member of no sect. Indeed, Tieck says of him:

With his poetical and philosophic quality of mind, with his mystical tendency, it was possible for him, as a profound believer in Christ, to combine admiration for the poetical or æsthetic aspects of the Catholic Church with veneration for Luther and Calvin, and these with esteem for the Moravians and enthusiasm for Spinoza and the German, as well as for the Neoplatonic, philosophy.

This comprehensive cognition of the true, beautiful, and good, wherever manifested and expressed, was not the product of incertitude or of a mental process which finds its analogue in miscegenation. It was, rather, the attitude of an intellect that had been brought to act upon literature rather than life; for, it seems to me, Novalis was not so much a student of man as of mind. He wrote a romance, it is true, and he wrote poetry; but he lacked those elements of imagination and sympathy which characterize Dickens, Thackeray, Collins, and Hall Caine. Instead of creating or portraying "characters,"

vivid and vivific, he analyzed the abstract "soul" and produced a "system." Will and reason, love and hate—these the great novelist sees in their frenzied interplay in the tragedy of life; but if he calmly and in philosophic mood study their causes and effects he will not, cannot produce a work of fiction that the people will read, and the people do not read *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* and *The Pupils at Sais*. In fact, despite his monument, Novalis is not a popular author. His writings are known only to a small circle of thinkers, who find in them profound thought problems, the solution of which is an education in abstract ratiocination and an inspiration to philosophic faith. He is deficient both in humor and in pathos. His appeal is solely to the cold intellect, and his ideal individual man is one who "conducts an endless and complex drama, in which gallery and pit, actor and spectator, are one, and he himself poet, director, and hero of the piece."

He conceives of the State, too, as a person, whose special and inner organs are the court, the theater, the palace, the Church, the capital, public assemblies, academics, and colleges—that is to say, to use Elisha Mulford's term, as a moral organism. "The State has natural rights and duties, like the individual man," he says. This conception makes him serious. He has no desire to raise a laugh, no wish to bring tears. He sets himself the admirable, if difficult, task of creating moral sentiment, of portraying a high ideal. He will be the dedicated priest of the State's rights and duties. This is the glory of Novalis—this young man of Weissenfels—that in the genial energy of his ambitious efforts to seize upon the very heart of truth, he discerned the essential obligation of the individual human life to be the recognition of rights and the performance of duties.

For the Christian theologian the value of his career and writings lies in the fact that, possessing an intellect so subtle and sensitive, so active and acute, he could not repudiate Christianity. I am aware that his faith in Jesus has been pronounced eccentric—the unique assent of a philosopher-poet who saw in the biography of the Man of Nazareth the supreme, unassailable truth of poetry. "The history of Christ," he says, "is even as really a poem as a history—and generally history is only a history which can be fable." He does not discredit the

evangelists' picturesque and popular accounts of the thaumaturgic acts of Jesus; but for himself he has no need of the gospels as a corroboration of the Gospel. "The Holy Spirit," he thinks, "is more than the Bible; he should be our Teacher of Christianity, not the dead, earthly, ambiguous letter." Do we start at this and pronounce it dangerous? Is it any more dangerous than Paul's declaration that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life?" Novalis himself was not independent of the letter, although he technically and logically subordinated it to the spirit of truth. His biographers relate that during the closing year of his career "he read very diligently in the Bible, also much of Zinzendorf's and Lavater's writings." Very pathetic to me is this picture of the "ardent" youth—"tall, slender, of noble appearance," with "clear and flashing eyes," resembling Dürer's portraits of the evangelist John, as his friends liked to think—poring over the pages of the German Bible and the writings of the Moravian Zinzendorf and Lavater. He interprets, perhaps, as a mystic and as a student of Spinoza, Fichte, Kant, and Goethe. He thinks that the Bible should "grow;" that every true book, written by a reverent and holy spirit, is a Bible, and even that the history of every man should be a Bible. But he is a mystic, as he himself says, because in essence religion, love, nature, and the State are mystical. He follows the great philosophers and the great poets because he believes them to be organs of supreme truth, whose errors truth will counteract. He recognizes the products of inspiration in current literature and in common life, because he believes that God can still energize the receptive intellect and that in every human existence the elements of good and evil coexist in conflict, thus producing a tragedy the inner truth of which is the same as that of the world's awful history. Such a man, so endowed and so environed, cannot read the sacred Scriptures like the *curé*, whose education was begun in the Sunday school and completed in the seminary. To him it is a greater, deeper, richer book, one of infinitely various suggestion.

History, to him, is, indeed, a "huge anecdote," but it is more—a category of "evolutions." Ninety years ago this co-thinker of Pascal, Shelley, and Coleridge uttered the keynote of the historical process—the keynote of modern science:

Evolutions are the material of history. What is not now developed will attain its consummation in a future or repeated experiment. Nothing which history apprehends is transient. Out of innumerable transformations it advances to ever-riper forms.

In the Germany of his day, sympathetic with revolutionary, rationalistic France, he saw "the universal individuality, the new history, and the new humanity" in the bitter fight of antagonistic forces, the fiery outburst of political Protestantism, the vast and violent upheaval of long-suppressed discontents. He saw the marriage of the young Church and the loving God, whose Son was the image of the Father—of clear and infinite vision, of prophetic and miraculous gifts, of consoling grace—

The Saviour, who, like a true genius, born among men, cannot be seen, only believed in, but spiritually visible in countless forms to the believing ones—as the bread and wine of the common meal, as the beloved one in pure embrace, as the air inhaled, as the word and the song apprehended by heart and mind, as death itself—all received under keenest pains of love in the inner life of the quiescent womb.

To him the historic process is an evolution; but it is a birth, and birth means life from life, under permanent laws of mutual rights and duties. He does not attempt a formal exposition of these laws; but, unlike Lessing, who, as he thinks, "saw individual facts too keenly," he seems to have subordinated laws and events to what he terms "the magical effect of the whole environing circumstance," and penetrates to the all-permanent, all-determining, and all-pervasive moral springs of action. And so "history is a gospel"—a message of God to man. He is so dominated by the æsthetic sense that he sees poetry in this gospel, as, indeed, in religion, Christianity, nature, and the sciences. Indeed, his objective point is the reconciliation of the æsthetic and the ethic. It is this program of thought which makes possible two such passages as these:

Revolutions are no proof of real energy in a nature. There is an energy arising from weakness which is often more forcible than true energy, but ends in greater weakness.

The world and its history will be transfigured into holy writings, even as from the holy writings you will learn how simply and clearly the greatest events can be recorded; perhaps not directly by them, but their elevating and animating influence will arouse a higher faculty within you.

In the first he diagnoses a crisis; he projects a system in the second and writes the biography of his mind. In this semi-occult, mystical way the "higher faculty" within himself had been aroused. He beheld the transfiguration of the world and its history into holy writings, and, reading the Scriptures, he apprehended the prophetic secret of recording great events. One desires to know how Novalis read the Kings, the Chronicles, and the Books of Samuel. What a unique commentary he would have written! Seeing human beings as "thoughts precipitated in space"—women as "symbols of goodness and beauty," men as "symbols of truth and righteousness"—he would have produced a philosophy of tragedy, a drama of spiritual truth. Samuel, David, Saul, with other imposing characters, would have moved to and fro on the crowded stage of the ancient Hebrew life as "matured wills;" and this young German mystic, sitting through whole nights and illuminating the fast-changing themes by coruscations of fancy and incisive judgment, would have shown the divine program of world-history in the action and reaction of the volitional force of the individual life. As it is, the student of Novalis opens his Bible with keener sense of the "deep below deep" in human character and conduct. He feels that there is more truth and yet more truth—a holy place and a holy of holy places. The One over all becomes more real, and prophet and apostle seem nearer to the senses of the soul.

Of Novalis himself his friend Just says that he developed an ever-deepening love of Jesus and a profound reverence for the virgin mother, inspired by his æsthetic apprehension of the spiritual beauty of her relation to the Man of Nazareth. The mystery and majesty of their personality alike impressed and inspired him. He recognized in them the coordinate and coacting elements of history. In Jesus he saw the supremely mysterious, supremely majestic Person—the Man whose biography is the key to history and the solution of life's problem. Of this climacteric character—at once of earth and of heaven, of time and of eternity, of man and of God—he seldom utters the name, not even in his hymns; perhaps because he had not yet determined upon a definite principle of classification; perhaps because, despite his early Moravian education, he could not implicitly accept the orthodox *dictum* that Jesus is incarnate God.

He believes, it is true, in a theophany. "God," he says, "must be sought among men. In human events, in human thought and feeling, the Spirit of heaven reveals himself most clearly." But he does not believe in the one incarnation, for, in one of his apothegms, he expresses the opinion that if God can become man he can also become "stone, plant, animal, and element." This would exclude Novalis from the category of Christians, if to be a Christian is to believe in the unique and exclusive divinity of Jesus. Yet he is not a pantheist, for he specifically avers that "God must be separated from nature—God has, really, nothing to do with nature. He is the object or goal of nature—he for whom nature exists, with whom it shall yet harmonize. Nature shall become moral." God has no history, but he is in history, because in him man lives, moves, and has his being. Nature is not God, but God is in nature, because its laws are the mode of his operations. The study of history and of nature, if this be true, is theological as well as anthropological—of course, primarily anthropological, because man first sees man; but the knowledge of God is essential to the knowledge of man, as the knowledge of man is essential to the knowledge of God.

"What is man?" asks Novalis, and answers, "A perfected figure of the spirit." "All men are variations of one complete individual, that is, of one marriage. An accord of variations is a family." "Spirit and person are one." "The spirit galvanizes the soul by means of the gross senses; its self-activity is galvanism." "Soul and body galvanize each other, at least according to an analogous art, but their laws lie in a higher region." "The seat of the soul is where the inner world and the outer world meet. Where they interpenetrate—at the point of interpenetration is it." If this be the place of the soul is it not an "accidental product," as the point of interpenetration of inner and outer world varies? This is the question that Novalis asks: "Is the place of the soul dependent upon will or is it accidental?" Accidental, he concludes. "The place of the soul is now here, now there, now in many places at once; it is mutable, variable. Its place is in the members of the body, as one may learn through the dominant passions." This, so far as it relates to the interaction of body and spirit, agrees with modern psychology. However, one feels in reading these

"thoughts" that the poet-philosopher is, if it may be so said, guessing at truth. He is not a physiologist, neither is he a psychologist; but, discerning vital relations between body (that one "temple of the universe") and soul and spirit, he conceives that spirit galvanizes soul and that body and soul galvanize each other. Yet, whether he advances this as a scientific theory or only as a mystical suggestion based on supposed analogy it would be difficult to determine. Superficially he seems a materialist of the grossest type, as when he says, "Our thought is absolutely only a galvanization." "Soul oxydizes—sensation deoxydizes." On the same page, however, yes, even in the same paragraph, he soars into the realms of the transcendental, as when, having pronounced thought the product of a chemical process, he says it is "a contact of the earthly spirit and the spiritual atmosphere, through a heavenly, supernatural medium—logic, corresponding to meteorology." "The human spirit can approximately imitate external symptoms; it must also have analogies with the elements and forces of nature." "As the body is united with the world, so the soul with the spirit. Both paths lead out from man and terminate in God. Both circumnavigators meet at corresponding points of their course. Both must think toward the center, and, in spite of distance, must remain together and, in union, make both journeys." "Both paths terminate in God"—he accepts this as the interpretation of life's processes, and conjoins faith and philosophy in his theory that nature and spirit are wedded in man, whose body is consonant with spirit.

Being a philosopher of a unique type, Novalis considers man not only as ideally the perfected figure or projection of spirit, but in his contrasted physico-psychical conditions of sleeping and waking—his night-life and his day-life. Viewed from his mystical standpoint, what is sleep—the sleep of this creature of body and soul?

Sleep is a complex [mixed] condition of body and soul. In sleep body and soul are chemically united; the soul is uniformly distributed through the body. The man is neutralized. Waking is a divided, polarized condition; the soul is brought to a point—localized. Sleep is digestion of the soul; the body digests the soul—a withdrawing of the soul's graces. Waking is an interweaving of the soul's graces—the body utilizes the soul. In sleep the bands of the system are loose; in waking they are tightened.

Is this intelligible? Is it scientific? Let us say, only, that it is as Novalis saw the phenomena and, through them, those obscure laws which the physiologic-psychologists are straining their brains to apprehend and formulate. What is death? "Death is nothing but the interruption of the interchange between the soul and the world." That interchange, that intercommunion, shall be renewed? Yes. How? When? To these questions the New Testament, and the New Testament alone, gives definitive answer in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body—a spirit-body, transformed into the image of Christ's glorious body, adapted to the new heavens and the new earth.

In the meantime, what is the relation between man and nature? The poet-philosopher's answer is given as follows in *The Pupils at Saïs*:

We stand in as many and as immeasurably different relations to nature as to man; and as to the child she shows herself child-like and bends benignly down to his infant heart, so to the god she shows herself godlike and attunes herself to his high spirit. We cannot say that there is one nature without saying something excessive, exaggerated; and all attempts to arrive at truth by discussions and conversations about nature do but remove us farther from the natural. Much is already gained, when the effort fully to understand nature ennobles itself into a longing, a tender and humble longing, which even the cold, reserved temper soon learns to delight in if once it feels secure of a more intimate acquaintance with her. There is a secret attraction toward all points, diverging from an infinitely deep center within us. As wondrous nature, sensible and insensible, lies round about us, we think every one of her features an exercise of this attractive power, a manifestation of the sympathy which exists between her and us. But behind those blue, distant mountains one man seeks the home which they veil from his sight. . . . Another thinks that, far on the other side, unknown glories await him; he believes that a future, full of life and beauty, lies hidden there, and he stretches his hands wistfully toward that new world. Some few stand motionless and serene in the midst of the glorious spectacle; they seek to embrace it in its fullness and concatenation, but they forget not in the whole that radiant thread which runs through and enlinks its parts and forms the holy crown of light. Such spirits are blessed in the contemplation of this living and more than midnight depth of all-pervading beauty.

Thus arise manifold ways of viewing nature; and, in some, sensibility to her beauty is a joyous sensation—a banquet. In others we see it transformed into the most reverential religion, giving direction, support, and significance to the whole of life.

Even in the infancy of nations such deep and earnest spirits have been found, to whom nature wore the countenance of Deity; while other gay and joyous hearts thought of her only as a host, at whose bounteous table they might freely seat themselves. To them the free air was a cordial drink; the stars, lamps to illumine the nightly dance; plants and animals, costly and delicate viands; and thus did nature present herself to their minds, not as a still and awful temple, but as a plenteous kitchen and merry banquetting hall.

In an intermediate class between these two were others, whose view of nature, though differing from the last, had yet reference to the senses alone. These saw in actual nature only a vast but as yet wild and unreclaimed park or pleasure ground, and were busied, day and night, in creating patterns of a more refined and perfect nature. They divided themselves into companies for the accomplishment of the great work. Some sought to awaken mute and forgotten tones in air and wood. Others stamped their conceptions and images of more beautiful forms on brass or stone; built up from the rock more stately piles for dwellings; brought to light hidden treasures from the clefts of the earth; tamed the wayward and lawless stream; peopled the inhospitable sea; carried plants of long-known and excellent virtue into desert zones; checked the wild overspread of forests, and tended the nobler flowers and herbs; opened the earth to the life-giving motions of generative air and enkindling light; taught colors to blend and arrange themselves in beautiful pictures, and wood and meadow, fountain and rock, to unite in one lovely garden; breathed tones into the living members, unfolded their mysterious connection, and taught them to move in livelier and more joyous vibrations; adopted the defenseless animals which were susceptible of some touch of human culture, and cleared the woods of those noxious beasts which seemed like the monstrous births of a distempered fancy.

Soon did nature assume a kindlier aspect; she was softer and more refreshing, and willingly hearkened to all the wishes of man. By degrees her heart began to have a human motion; her fancies were brighter; she became social and freely replied to the friendly inquirer; and so the golden age appeared to be gradually returning, when she was the friend, the comforter, the priestess of men; when she lived among them, and her divine society and intercourse raised them into immortals.

This is apologue—and more: it is a microcosmic definition of the action and reaction of man and his environment, and is the elaboration of that “Fragment” in which Novalis describes the evolution of genius:

If our body itself is nothing but the common center of our senses we have power over them, to incite them to action as we

will, to center them at a common point. It then rests with us only to give ourselves such a body as we will. So, if our senses are nothing but modifications of the organ of thought, the absolute element, shall we, together with mastery over this element, possess power to direct and modify our senses according to our pleasure. The painter has, in a measure, the eye in his power [under his control]; the musician, the ear; the poet, the imagination, the organ of speech and emotion; the philosopher, the absolute organ, and works through it as he will, and through it represents the spirit-world. Genius is nothing but spirit in this effective use of the senses. Hitherto we have had only isolated genius; but the spirit shall become totally genius.

I know of no profounder, more adequate definition of genius: "spirit in effective use of the senses." This differentiates men. The common man is five-sensed; the genius also is five-sensed, but he seems six-sensed, or even seven-sensed—he sees and hears so much more in the world that he shares with the common man. "The poet," as preeminently the man of genius, "understands nature better than the man of science."

Such is Novalis's conception of man as a complex psychophysical entity, a being in and of the universal order, subject to immutable laws of matter and sense and cognizant of them. But, says he:

Strange that the inner world of man should be so poorly estimated and so spiritlessly treated! So-called psychology belongs among those masks that occupy the places in the sanctuary where the real faces of the gods should appear. What little use yet has physics for the mind or the mind for the outer world? Intelligence, fancy, and reason—these are the poor framework of the universe in us. Of their marvelous interrelations, appearances, and transitions no word [in psychology]. To no one does it fall to seek their new, unnamed forces and their social connections. Who knows what wonderful alliances, what wonderful births, are imminent in the inner world?

In that "inner world," whose ground is our own inner plurality, was his real, dominant life. In it he found an element higher than the physical, higher than the psychical—the spiritual, that which is of the divine and ideally subject to the divine. He found God, and the finding touched his emotions. He worshiped; but he audaciously declared that a moral God is greater than a magical God—a God who is good than a God

who works wonders. He prayed, conceiving that prayer in religion is analogous in process and result to thought in philosophy. He penetrated to the essence or order of the divine life. What did he find? Simply mathematics. God is a being who thinks according to the laws of mathematics; or, perhaps, he who apprehends mathematics thinks as God thinks. This is so vitally true to him that he pronounces pure mathematics religion; so true that he declares that "he who does not take up a mathematical work with reverence and read it as a word of God does not understand it." "He who will seek God once will find him everywhere," he says—an encyclopedic or ecumenic revelation in all truth. For Novalis all paths of thought led to the throne. Did he see God, there in Weissenfels, as Moses saw him on Sinai or as Emerson saw him at Concord? Is God anywhere as he is everywhere? And can he be seen as well by a Sunday school pupil, who recites the catechism formula, as by a man "without vanity, learned haughtiness, affectation, and hypocrisy, genuine, true, the purest, loveliest embodiment of a high, immortal spirit"—such as Novalis appeared to that little circle of kindred "guessers at truth" in which he coruscated during the days and nights of a hundred years ago? Well, it is possible for a child, hearing and heeding the "little voice," to walk in ways that lead to the vision—awed, subdued, inspired by disclosures of eternal law; but to such a thinker as Hardenberg, the mystic, eager to know the whole of life and the whole of law, the vision must be fuller, more awful, more sublime, and, at the same time, nearer. Novalis, like Emerson after him, believed in the immanent—the over-soul—the inner one—and, like him, he seems to have been pure, realized purity, and, therefore, emphasized character, goodness, excellence of motive, symmetry of impulse, obedience to the will of the Holiest.

The moral, properly understood, is the real life element. It is identical with piety. Our own moral will is the will of God. In that we fulfill his will, we gladden and broaden our own being, and it is as if we had willed from our own inner nature. Sin is surely the only evil in the world. All trouble comes from it. Who understands sin understands virtue, Christianity, himself, and the world. Without this understanding one cannot make the merit of Christ his own, one has no part in this second, higher creation.

Such a passage as this, like an echo of a Moravian sermon, differentiates Novalis from other mystics and warrants our placing him in the category of Christian philosophers. A mystic he was whose mysticism was founded in faith, built in hope, and beautified with elements of permanent and corroborated trust in truth as incarnated in Jesus; a mystic whose mysticism found expression in hymns so simple, so near to the "plain people," that they have been sung by the Moravians, spiritual progenitors of the Methodists. Says William F. Stephenson, in his *Biography of Certain Hymns*:

Novalis, poet and philosopher, wrote some hymns of a wonderful and gracious beauty, intelligible to all, moreover, and singularly distinct from those speculations that ranked him chief of mystic thinkers. His father, a business-like, prosaic workingman, troubled himself little about either poet or philosopher—considered rhyming, indeed, purely mischievous; but, having a theory that boys would be boys, neither interfered with Novalis nor, it is believed, read a line he ever wrote, unless it was in the ledger. Novalis died in his bright youth, and, soon after, his father attended the Moravian church, as his custom was. The congregation sang words that he had never heard before, so thrilling, so full of Christian passion, so mournfully sweet, that he was deeply moved and, on leaving the church, asked a neighbor how they had come by so glorious a hymn and if he knew the author's name. "Why," he replied, starting back, "don't you know? It was your own son!"

Although a mystic Novalis did not believe in the individual annihilation of the will or in the absorption of the human spirit in the divine during ecstasy or contemplation of God; for he distinctly avers that character is the fully matured will. There was no character without action of will, strenuous and persistent. He assented to the verity and validity of that Talmud prayer, "May thy will be done as if it were my will, that my will may be done as if it were thy will;" and in faith he discerned an act of the free will—a choice. "Practical, earthly faith is will, the perception of the realized will."

From the practicalities of ethics, embodying a philosophy of the laws of conduct and character, Novalis passes with the facility of profound and accurate thought to the nonmoral aspects of pure æsthetics and literature. He sees to the core of music, language, poetry. He discusses Goethe, Klopstock, Shakespeare. He analyzes the elements of the great products

of literary genius, and dissects the influences of the world upon mind, especially the receptive, productive mind of the author, the musician, and the painter. His apothegms are a sufficient treatment of the subjects on which he thinks, they are so compact in expression and idea. No need of more words; that is his view. A paragraph is better than a page, a page better than a book, if it embody a whole argument. Novalis's apothegms are arguments. In them lie the germs of essays, pamphlets, sermons, and volumes. If they appear mysterious, so is life in its origin and mode of persistence. They are not the less worthy of study because they are sometimes abstruse. Indeed, we know of no better test of mental culture. One leaves them, but cannot forget them, and returns to their translation, after the lapse of months or years, to gauge his growth. If he apprehend them he may pronounce himself possessed of a more comprehensive culture, a finer insight, a subtler spiritual vision; not the less fitted for "business," that he is placed within the boundaries of that invisible world from which proceed the multiplex activities of the street; not the less fitted for the vocation of preaching, for it is Novalis who says, "Every sermon should be a fragment of the Bible." Indeed, if the orthodox preacher desire one book, a product of the German mind, from which to obtain a stimulus to deep thinking that will possess its own correctives, he need only read the suggestive pages of this ardent, pure youth, who in intellectual trances had visions of truth, and he will find himself richer of fancy, more fertile of illustration, more fervent in his desire to know that which may be known of God and man and the complex world in which God and man coexist and coact in the evolution of world history.

G. M. Hammell.

ART. V.—THE PAULINE EPISTLES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—PART I.

OF the thirteen Pauline epistles only the first four were received as genuine by Ferdinand Christian Baur and his followers. And although the theory of Baur and the Tübingen school was long ago and repeatedly confuted, yet even to the present day there are those who are in some measure influenced by it. The theory is dead, but its ghost haunts the minds of many. Such men as Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer, in Germany, and Davidson, in England, still question or deny the genuineness of several of the epistles; and there is more or less of popular impression that perhaps the last nine are not quite as well authenticated as the first four. But it is to be noticed that the arguments against the Pauline authorship of these epistles are drawn wholly from their contents and from the disagreement between them and the doubters' theories of what they ought to be, not at all from an examination of the external evidences for the date and authorship of the letters or from any alleged inadequate attestation of their antiquity and genuineness. Now, however acute may be the analysis and subtle and elaborate the theories which go to show that Paul would not, or could not, have written this or that, they cannot outweigh the fixed fact of positive testimony that he did write it, if once that fact is fully established. Davidson himself says:

It is not given to the many to judge aright of internal evidence, which may be pushed unduly to the disparagement of the external.*

And Jowett also justly remarks:

How an author *ought* to have written is a question in which imagination has a wide range. A meager induction gathered from a few short works is not a sufficient criterion of how he must have written everywhere and at all times.†

In the case of Paul's epistles is there even this clew? Can it be said that there are a few epistles so much better authenticated than the others that they can serve as a standard by which the

* Samuel Davidson: *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, Preface, p. 7. Second edition, London, 1882.

† Benjamin Jowett: *Commentary on Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans*, p. 19. Second edition, 1859.

others must be judged? On what grounds can any one or more of these letters be pronounced the unquestionably genuine? Why make Galatians, for example, the standard of Pauline style and doctrine rather than Ephesians, unless there is stronger external testimony in its favor?

A comparison of the external attestation of the disputed epistles with that of the four accepted ones may therefore be interesting. Although but little early Christian literature has come down to us, yet we have enough of it to form the basis of a fair comparison; and the paucity of the literature presses with equal severity on both classes of the epistles. A greater difficulty in making such a comparison arises from the loose way of quoting customary among ancient writers. In times when it was necessary to refer to a cumbrous roll in order to verify a passage citing from memory was more frequent than in this age of books. Verbal inaccuracies were consequently frequent. It was the habit to quote freely and to combine passages from various parts of an author or from various authors. Sometimes a long passage is compressed; sometimes a short one is expanded; sometimes a paraphrase is given expressing the sense in the writer's own words. The same passage is variously quoted at different times. Sometimes only verbal coincidences, the use of a catch-word, special collocations of words, indicate the reference to an author. Often mere allusions are made to passages with which it is assumed that both the readers and the writer are familiar. The words given are an echo, rather than a quotation. Thus it is impossible to draw out and compare the external testimony by any exact collection of lists and figures. The quotations themselves cannot be enumerated or even classified with precision. Yet the very freeness and inaccuracy of the quotations often imply more than mere literal exactness would, just because there is taken for granted a familiarity with Paul's epistles which is of itself evidence of their authority and genuineness. But while it is impossible to count up the distinct quotations from this or that epistle the authors who use the one or the other can be counted, the relative age and trustworthiness of their productions compared, and at least something determined respecting the frequency and unimitatableness of their quotations. And these quotations, though they do not, in most cases, directly prove Paul to be the author

of the writings ascribed to him, since his name is generally not mentioned, do still, in so far as they attest the very early origin of the epistles, practically establish their Pauline authorship.

I. One of the earliest and best attested works which have come down to us from the subapostolic age is the Letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians. Critics are agreed that it was probably written A. D. 93-97,* that is, only some thirty years after the death of Paul, which is supposed to have occurred not earlier than A. D. 64. Two Greek manuscripts and a Syriac manuscript of this letter are extant and have received the careful study of some of the ablest scholars. Clement not only speaks of Paul, but, as Bishop Lightfoot remarks, "shows that he is imbued with the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians, not to mention several minor letters of St. Paul." † The following extract from Clement plainly refers to the passage in Paul's letter given in the parallel column :

Clem., § 47. "Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul, the apostle. What wrote he first unto you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because that even then ye had made parties."

1 Cor. i, 10, 12. "Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment. . . . Now this I mean, that each one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ."

But in its express mention of an epistle written by Paul this extract is exceptional. In general Clement introduces his quotations without saying that he is quoting. He affords an

* How great the consensus of opinion on this date is may be seen from the following somewhat sonorous sentence: "Itaque Junius, Cotelarius, Tillemontius, Lumperus, Neanderus, Gieselerus, Rothius, Bleekius, Tholuckius, Bunsenus, Schliemannus, Koestlinus, Ritschellius, Thierschius, Lechlerus, Reussius, Angerus, Hilgenfeldius, Gundertus, Ekkerus, Lipsius, Ewaldius, Uhlhornius, Laurentius, Tischendorffius, Lightfootius, Pfeiderer[us?], Renanius, Hofmannus, Zahnus, Donaldsonius, Bryennius, alii recte indicaverunt, epistolam Domitiani tempore intra ann. 93-97 esse scriptam." Gebhardt and Harnack: *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera: Clem. Rom.*, Prol., pp. lix, lx. Leipzig, 1876.

† J. B. Lightfoot: *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement of Rome*, vol. i, p. 397. London, 1890. Lightfoot's translation of Clement and Polycarp has for the most part been followed here. In general his work has been of great service in the preparation of this essay. Credit is also due to Charteris, Funk, Gebhardt, Harnack, Lardner, Schaaf, Westcott, Zahn, et al.

excellent illustration of what has been just now said about the method of making citations which was customary in his day. His extracts from the New Testament are incorporated with the very texture of his letter, and, though clearly discernible, are yet inseparable from it. They are inwoven like a damask pattern, not superadded like an embroidery. A few characteristic specimens will here be given of his use of Paul's epistles:

Clem., § 32. "For of Jacob are all the priests and Levites who minister unto the altar of God; of him is the Lord Jesus as concerning the flesh."

Clem., § 35. "Casting off from us all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, strifes, malignities, and deceits, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vainglory and inhospitality. For they that do these things are hateful to God; and not only they that do them, but they also that consent unto them."

Clem., § 36. "Through Him our foolish and darkened mind springeth up unto light." And again:

Clem., § 51. . . . "perished . . . because their foolish hearts were hardened."

Clem., § 46. "Wherefore do we tear and rend asunder the members of Christ and stir up factions against our own body and . . . forget that we are members one of another?"

Rom. ix, 4, 5. "Who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh."

Rom. i, 29-32. "Being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, hateful to God, insolent, haughty, boastful, . . . who, knowing the ordinance of God, that they which practice such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also consent with them that practice them."

Rom. i, 21. "Their foolish heart was darkened." And also:

Eph. iv, 17, 18. "As the Gentiles also walk in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding."

Rom. xii, 5. "So we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another." Also:

Eph. iv, 25. "We are members one of another."

In § 47, after saying that "it is shameful, . . . yes, utterly shameful, . . . that it should be reported that the very steadfast and ancient Church of the Corinthians . . . maketh sedition," Clement continues, "And this report hath reached not only us, but them also which differ from us;" and, the thought of this suggesting to him Paul's strong expression (Rom. ii, 24), "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you," Clement immediately adds, "so that ye even heap blasphemies on the name of the Lord by reason of your folly." In §§ 37, 38 is the following passage, manifestly suggested by Paul's simile, 1 Cor. xii, 12, *ff.*: "Let us take our

body as an example. The head without the feet is nothing ; so likewise the feet without the head are nothing. Even the smallest limbs of our body are necessary and useful for the whole body ; but all the members conspire and unite in subjection, that the whole body may be saved. So in our case let the whole body be saved in Christ Jesus, and let each man be subject unto his neighbor." So Clem., § 49, is an epitome, as it were, of 1 Cor. xiii, having the words of Peter (1 Pet. iv, 8),* "Love covereth a multitude of sins," incorporated into it, and concluding with an echo of Paul's words in Eph. v, 2, or, perhaps, Gal. ii, 20. In § 34 Clement quotes a passage which Paul (1 Cor. ii, 9) had paraphrased from the Hebrew of Isa. lxiv, 4 ; but Clement slightly alters the paraphrase by substituting an expression from the passage as it stands in the Septuagint, yet in the main adheres to Paul, thus : "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which he hath prepared for them that wait for him." A similar agreement with Paul's quotation rather than with the original is found in § 13, where, in quoting from Jer. ix, 23, 24, or 1 Sam. ii, 10, Clement's quotation, "But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord" (see 1 Cor. i, 31, and 2 Cor. x, 17), is like Paul's in its variation from the Septuagint.

These are specimen passages of Clement's use of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians, with which epistles it is conceded that he was familiar, and to which, since he lived in Rome and was writing to Corinth, we might presume that his references would be the most explicit and frequent. We can now compare his use of these epistles with his use of the other Pauline epistles. There are several passages besides the doubtful one already noticed which may be reminiscences of the Epistle to the Galatians, but they need not be dwelt on. The Epistle to the Ephesians Clement makes frequent use of. Two or three instances have already been noticed ; a few more will be given here :

Clem., § 32. "And so we, having been called through his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom, or understanding, or piety, or works which	Eph. ii, 8-10. "For by grace have ye been saved through faith ; and that not of yourselves : it is the gift of God ; not of works, that no man should glory. For we are his workmanship, created in
---	---

* This passage in Peter's epistle may be borrowed from Prov. x, 12.

we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby the Almighty God justified all men that have been from the beginning."

Clem., § 38. "Let each man be subject unto his neighbor."

Clem., § 46. "Wherefore are there strifes . . . and divisions and war among you? Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was shed upon us? And is there not one calling in Christ?"

Clem., § 64. "God . . . who chose the Lord Jesus Christ, and us through him for a peculiar people."

Eph. v, 21. "Subjecting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ."

Eph. iv, 3-6. "Giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

Eph. i, 4. "He chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love."

Clement's use of Philippians is not very obvious; but there are expressions and verbal coincidences which, though each in itself is slight, yet, all combined, indicate acquaintance with the epistle. One instance occurs in

Clem., § 16. "The scepter of God, even our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of arrogance or of pride, though he might have done so, but in lowliness of mind. . . . If the Lord was thus lowly of mind, what should we do?"

Phil. ii, 5, ff. "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant," etc.

The passage already cited from Clem., § 47, contains in the phrase, "in the beginning of the gospel," a verbal coincidence with Phil. iv, 15; and other examples might be given. Of Paul's Epistle to the Colossians a few echoes and verbal resemblances are to be found. For example, Clem., § 21, "If we walk not worthily of him and do those things which are good and well-pleasing in his sight," calls to mind Paul's prayer that the Colossians might "walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing" (Col. i, 10). And again, when Clement (§§ 49, 50) says, "Who can declare the bond of the love of God? . . . there is no declaring its perfection," he seems to have in mind Paul's exhortation (Col. iii, 14), "Put on love, which is the bond of perfectness." Allusions to the Epistles to the Thessalonians are not very marked. Yet Clement's expression (§ 38), "Let the whole body be saved in Christ Jesus," recalls 1 Thess. v, 23, "May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire,

without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Also, Clement's "We ought in all things to give thanks to him" resembles Paul's "In everything give thanks" (verse 18). The First Epistle to Timothy is repeatedly used by Clement. A few instances are the following:

Clem., § 7. "Let us see what is good and what is pleasant and what is acceptable in the sight of him that made us."

1 Tim. ii, 3. "This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour." Also:

1 Tim. v, 4. "This is acceptable in the sight of God."

Clem., § 21. "Not in factious preferences, but without partiality."

1 Tim. v, 21. "Without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality."

Clem., § 29. "Let us therefore approach him in holiness of soul, lifting up pure and undefiled hands unto him."

1 Tim. ii, 8. "I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands."

Clem., § 61. "Thou, . . . King of the ages."

1 Tim. i, 17. "Now unto the King of the ages." (So in the Greek.)

There are several expressions which may be reminiscences of phrases in the Second Epistle to Timothy, but they are not very marked. In § 2 Clement uses the words "ready unto every good work," found in Titus iii, 1; and a few other expressions may echo certain of Paul's in the same epistle. To Philemon there is no reference.

The foregoing examination shows that Ephesians is as decidedly attested by Clement as Romans; and more decidedly than 2 Corinthians and Galatians. Yet this very Epistle to the Ephesians is one whose early origin and Pauline authorship have been especially disputed. Again, it is to be noticed that the passages in Clement's letter taken from 1 Timothy and Philippians and (though in less degree) Colossians and Titus are more marked than those from 2 Corinthians and Galatians. Also, 1 Timothy is better authenticated by Clement than 2 Timothy; yet it is called less Pauline by the skeptical critics. Should it be said that Clement's loose method of quotation leaves us in doubt whether these resemblances prove anything more than a mode of thinking and arguing common both to him and to Paul, or a common drawing from another source, or even whether the epistles attributed to Paul may not have been later than Clement's letter and the expressions borrowed from the latter, it may be answered that we know that Clement did have the First Epistle to the Corinthians in his hands, and we find that he has used

it in precisely the same free way as he has used the other epistles. In quoting from the Old Testament also Clement is often equally free. Professor Charteris says: "Out of fifty-seven quotations from the Old Testament only seventeen are exact; and some of the others are so widely variant as to make it doubtful whether even a treacherous memory could be the cause of the divergence."* It has already been intimated that the testimony of Clement is especially valuable, not only because his letter is itself remarkably well attested, but also because, when he wrote, persons were still alive who had known the apostles and had listened to their teachings.

II. A second most important witness is Polycarp, the disciple of the apostle John and the teacher of Irenæus. A well authenticated letter written by him to the Philippians has come down to us. Its date cannot be precisely fixed, but it was probably written a few months after the death of Ignatius, † which took place in the reign of Trajan, that is, between A. D. 98 and 117.‡ Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna, lived to a great age, and suffered martyrdom most probably in A. D. 155. § Polycarp, like Clement, carries us back to the days of the apostolic teaching; and, through his connection with Irenæus, he forms a link between those days and the unbroken chain of the later church history. It may be worth while to recall here a few sentences of the account of him given by Irenæus in a letter to Florinus:

I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than the events of recent occurrence, . . . so that I can tell the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord and about his miracles and about his teaching Polycarp, as having received them from eyewitnesses of the

* A. H. Charteris: *Canonicity*, p. xiii. Edinburgh and London, 1880.

† Theodor Zahn: *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera: Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae*, p. xlv. Leipzig, 1876. Also Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers: Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. i, p. 583. Second edition, 1889.

‡ Lardner places the martyrdom of Ignatius as early as A. D. 108. (Lardner's *Works*, vol. ii, p. 98. London, 1838.) Lightfoot says it "may with a high degree of probability be placed within a few years of A. D. 110, before or after." (J. B. Lightfoot: *Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. i, p. 30. Second edition, 1889.)

§ See a thorough discussion of the date, Lightfoot, *ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 646-722

life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures.*

Irenæus expressly mentions the "Epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians;" and Jerome also says, "To this day [it] is read in the assembly of Asia."† Polycarp's letter, though short, is remarkably full of quotations and reminiscences of our New Testament. Funk counts twenty-two from the epistles alone;‡ but it is difficult to enumerate them exactly, since their resemblance to the epistles is a matter of degree and, as was said before, it is hard to determine always just what degree of resemblance constitutes a quotation.

As Clement, when writing to the Corinthians, referred to Paul's letter to them, so Polycarp, when writing to the Church at Philippi, likewise mentions Paul's having written to the Philippians. In § 3 he says: "For neither am I, nor is any other like unto me, able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who, when he came among you, taught face to face with the men of that day the word; . . . who also, when he was absent, wrote a letter ["letters," in the Greek] unto you, into the which if ye look diligently ye shall be able to be builded up unto the faith," etc. And in §§ 9, 11 he speaks of Paul and his labors among them. Twice Polycarp quotes from Paul's epistles formally: in § 11, "Know we not that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teacheth?" (see 1 Cor. vi, 2;) and in § 12, "For I am persuaded that ye are well trained in the sacred writings. . . . It is said in these Scriptures, 'Be ye angry and sin not,' and, 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.'" The first injunction here quoted, "Be ye angry," etc., is found in the Septuagint, Psalm iv, 4; Paul quoted it in Eph. iv, 26, and added the second injunction. Polycarp quotes both, and styles both "scriptures"—"sacred writings." Usually, however, Polycarp, like Clement and others in his day, weaves his citations into his discourse without indicating formally that he is quoting. In a few instances he uses the words *εἰδότες ὅτι*, "knowing that," as a formula of quotation. In § 1 he introduces thus a reference to Eph. ii,

* Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiæ*, v. 20. Translated by Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. i, p. 445.

† See Lardner's *Works* (1838), vol. ii, p. 97.

‡ F. X. Funk: *Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe*, p. 34. Tübingen, 1883.

8, 9; in § 4, to 1 Tim. vi, 7; in § 5, to Gal. vi, 7.* Of his allusions to Paul's epistles the following may be noticed :

Polyc., § 3. "... Love toward God and Christ and toward our neighbor. For if any man be occupied with these, he hath fulfilled the commandment of righteousness; for he that hath love is far from all sin."

Polyc., § 6. "We must all stand at the judgment seat of Christ, and each man must give an account of himself." Polycarp here combines the two passages given in the opposite column.

Polyc., § 5. "Neither fornicators, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men shall inherit the kingdom of God."

Polyc., § 2. "Now he who raised up him from the dead will raise us up also."

Polyc., § 6. "Taking thought always for what is honorable in the sight of God and men."

Polyc., § 3. "Edified in the faith given to you, which is the mother of us all."

Polyc., § 5. "Knowing, then, that God is not mocked."

Polyc., § 12. "Who shall believe on our Lord and God Jesus Christ, and his Father, who raised him from the dead."

Polyc., § 1. "Ye know that it is by grace ye are saved; not of works, but by the will of God, through Jesus Christ."

Polyc., § 4. "Let us arm ourselves with the armor of righteousness."

Polyc., § 10. "Be ye all subject one to another."

Polyc., § 1. "The steadfast root of your faith, which was famed from primitive

Rom. xiii, 9, 10. "If there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; love therefore is the fulfillment of the law."

Rom. xiv, 10, 12. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God. . . . So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." And 2 Cor. v, 10. "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ."

1 Cor. vi, 9, 10. "Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men . . . shall inherit the kingdom of God."

2 Cor. iv, 14. "He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also."

2 Cor. viii, 21. "We take thought for things honorable, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men." Also Rom. xii, 17. "Take thought for things honorable in the sight of all men."

Gal. iv, 26. "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

Gal. vi, 7. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked."

Gal. i, 1. "Through Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." See also Col. ii, 12.

Eph. ii, 8, 9. "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works."

Eph. vi, 13, 14. "Take up the whole armor of God, . . . having put on the breastplate of righteousness." See also 2 Cor. vi, 7.

Eph. v, 21. "Subjecting yourselves one to another."

Phil. i, 4, 5. "Making my supplication with joy, for your fellowship"

* See Lightfoot's *Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. iii, pp. 325, 326.

times, abideth until now." This recalls furtherance of the gospel from the first Paul's commendation of the Philippian day until now." as found in the parallel column.

Polyc., § 9. "All these ran not in vain." Polycarp says this of "Paul himself and the rest of the apostles." Phil. ii, 16. "That I may have whereof to glory in the day of Christ, that I did not run in vain." See Gal. ii, 2.

Polyc., § 12. "Pray . . . for the enemies of the cross." Phil. iii, 18. "I . . . tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ."

Polyc., § 5. "If we conduct ourselves worthily of him." Phil. i, 27. "Let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ." And Col. i, 10. "Walk worthily of the Lord."

Polyc., § 10. "Stand fast, . . . being steadfast in the faith and unmovable." Col. i, 23. "Continue in the faith, grounded and steadfast." See 1 Cor. xv, 58.

Polyc., § 11. "If a man refrain not from covetousness he shall be defiled by idolatry." Col. iii, 5. "Covetousness, the which is idolatry." Also Eph. v, 5. "Covetous man, who is an idolater."

Polyc., § 4. "Praying without ceasing for all." 1 Thess. v, 17. "Pray without ceasing."

Polyc., § 11. "Count not such as enemies, but restore them as frail and erring members." 2 Thess. iii, 15. "Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother."

Polyc., § 11: "But I have not found any such thing in you, neither have heard thereof, among whom the blessed Paul labored, who were his letters [see 2 Cor. iii, 2] in the beginning. For he glorieth concerning you in all those churches which alone, at that time, knew the Lord." Lardner connects this passage with 2 Thess. i, 4: "We ourselves glory in you in the churches of God," and thinks that, as Thessalonica and Philippi were both in the province of Macedonia, Polycarp, in § 3, where he speaks of Paul's letters (using the plural, as above noticed), may refer to the Epistles to the Thessalonians, as well as to that to the Philippians.*

Polyc., § 4. "But the love of money is the beginning of all troubles. Knowing, therefore, that we brought nothing into the world, neither can we carry anything out," etc. 1 Tim. vi, 7, 10. "For we brought nothing into the world, for neither can we carry anything out. . . . For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil."

Polyc., § 5. "In like manner deacons should be blameless, . . . not double-manner must be grave, not double-

* Lardner's *Works* (1838), vol. ii, pp. 100, 101.

tongued, not lovers of money, temperate in all things."

Polyc., § 5. "He promised us to raise us from the dead, and that, if we conduct ourselves worthily of him, we shall also reign with him."

Polyc., § 9. "For they loved not the present world."

tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre. . . . Let them serve as deacons, if they be blameless."

2 Tim. ii, 12. "If we endure, we shall also reign with him."

2 Tim. iv, 10. "Demas forsook me, having loved this present world."

These references vary, of course, in distinctness and importance, some being much more pointed than others. There seems to be in Polycarp's brief letter allusion to almost every one of Paul's epistles except those to Titus and to Philemon. The use of 1 Thessalonians is, perhaps, doubtful, and that of Colossians is less marked than that of the other epistles. There is formal quotation from, or express mention of, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Philippians; possibly also, if Lardner's view be correct, of the letters to the Thessalonians. The references to both epistles to Timothy are especially clear.

Polycarp's testimony is of peculiar importance because of his chronological position; for if it should be said that, though Paul did write letters to the Ephesians and to the Philippians, yet they are not identified as those which we have now, the objection is refuted by the consideration that Polycarp's life, as above remarked, spanned the period from the apostles' time to the time of Irenæus. This is the dark, uncertain period when the pseudonymous letters are supposed to have been written in the name of Paul. But it is next to impossible that in Polycarp's lifetime Paul's letters could have been already lost and new letters written purporting to be the apostle's, and yet Polycarp be ignorant of it. The passages which he alludes to and quotes are found in our present Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Philippians; and it is practically certain, therefore, that we have the ones which he knew and which the Church since the days of Irenæus, his disciple, has recognized as the genuine letters of the apostle Paul.

C. T. Mead.

ART. VI.—DOWN WITH THE OLD—UP WITH THE NEW: “A RELIGION FOR ALL TIME.”

IN the *Arena* for March, 1893, is an article entitled “A Religion for All Time.” It is written by Louis R. Ehrich. He claims for his new religion that it will have universal adaptability, and also that it will be unchangeable in its nature, because it will be founded on immutable, fundamental truth. Before the new instauration is planted, however, the grounds on which it is to be set up are to be cleared off for the proposed erection. All existing religions and theologies, true or false, good, bad, or indifferent, are to be swept away and utterly overthrown. Even the old moral law which was issued amid the lightnings and thunders of “the mount which burned with fire” is fatally defective. It must be swept aside. The commandment, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” is unorthodox. It has been weighed in the balances of this new discoverer and projector and found wanting. The command which precedes this in the Bible, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” can be allowed a place in the new religion only as it is interpreted by the newer and better commandment, which displaces both the law of supreme love to God and of love to our fellow-man equal to that we bear to ourselves. We are to be taught how to love the Lord our God by adequately loving our neighbor. Both these commandments are to be taught and construed and accepted only in a new form of the commandment of neighbor-loving, namely, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor more than thyself.” This destructive treatment of the old law and the old religion admits of no halfway work. It must go right down to the bed rock and sweep the ground clean. No vestiges of the old must be suffered to remain. Even the respect due to the Son of God and the Son of man and so justly claimed by him is denied by blasphemous suggestions and insinuations, as will be seen before the conclusion of this paper. His miraculous origin and supernatural being are not admitted for a moment. This discloses the animus of the new departure.

This newest of all religions, or rather of all irreligious theories, would seem to make necessary a revision of the ancient

wise man's proverb, "There is no new thing under the sun." If this is not new the word has lost its meaning. If the writer had left some trace of the old Bible-system to those who in their earthly lives of sorrow and of trial have found in Jesus a solace and a healing balm, he would better have illustrated the value and beauty of the spirit of the new law which he advocates, and which requires that he shall love his neighbor more than he loves himself. His new religion would have been better enforced by his example if he had borne himself with kindlier temper toward those who had been weak enough or credulous enough to believe in Jesus Christ as he whom God has sent. It is not kindness to a blind man to take away the staff by which he makes his way in his midday darkness. Surely such conduct is not loving the blind neighbor more than this new prophet loves himself. It is not loving a man more than one loves himself to rob him of that which had been his shelter in the time of storm, and which in danger and doubt and fear had been defense, covering, stay, and comfort. It is not the way for one to show kindness to his fellow-man to rob him of hope and deliverance. Only an enemy could have done or attempted this.

The discoverer and promulger of the new evangel, who starts out by smiting down and discrediting what has brought to sick and dying men in this world of sin and sorrow all the comfort and hope they have ever found, furnishes but a sorry sample of what his discovery of a new religion can do to help men. Outside of Christian civilization there are no blessings so valuable and enriching as those which Christianity confers. Neither paganism, nor barbarism, nor infidelity bestows enriching gifts, or erects hospitals or asylums, or founds libraries, or builds universities or higher institutions of learning, or supports charitable homes, or systematically administers kindness and help to the souls and bodies of those who need them. What harm have these eleemosynary and humanitarian institutions done that they should be yielded up for a mere novelty at the command of an unknown, unauthorized teacher? But all such lovely flowers of Christ's religion bestrew the paths of historic Christianity with their bloom and beauty and fragrance. How hard-hearted and selfish the man who would sweep them away from the paths of those who have known their enriching value!

Is it the act of a true man and a real friend to destroy all these upspringing humanities in order that some adventurer may lay the basis for a new religion?

Let us examine with closer attention the new system presented. Let us advance with caution and carefully study the enemy's lines and trenches and see with what manner of circumvallation he proposes to invest the strong bulwarks of the religion of the Lord Jesus. If the enemy is clearly bent on taking away our Lord we shall do well to ascertain, if we may, where it is proposed to lay him. If we are summoned to surrender our hold upon the religion we have known and appreciated, let us be sure that we get something better before we yield it up. Let us carefully examine the new system proposed by Mr. Ehrich, which he claims is to be "a religion for all time," of universal adaptability, and unchangeable in its nature, because it will be based upon fundamental truth and because it will be in accordance with human reason and so will satisfy the demands of humanity. He says:

The old religions are crumbling. Everything eventually crumbles which is not true. Never was there so little theology, never so much true religion, as at the present day. Never have men attended church so little; never have they attended hospital and asylum meetings so assiduously. Christianity is going down; Jesus is rising higher and higher.

Raise the cry, true or false, of mad dog after an unfortunate canine, and you have already inaugurated the movement which will start all the exterminators upon their destructive business. Stoutly declare that the old religions are crumbling, include in this sweeping totality all religions, and you have laid the snare for a successful entrapping of many a thoughtless young man or woman, who only needed a suggestion of doubt or difficulty to become a first-class skeptic or a full-fledged agnostic or theosophist.

A peculiarity of this writer is that he combines, indiscriminately, things good and bad, religions true and false, facts and baseless assumptions, and then with unwarranted confidence in his generalizations closes the argument and calls it conclusive and logical. Take some examples from the above extract: "Old religions are crumbling. Everything eventually crumbles which is not true." Some old religions crumble because they are not

true. Confucianism in China has been deserted by probably a million Chinamen, who have forsaken it for Christianity. But it is a gratuitous assumption that Christianity is also crumbling; for Christianity is true and is not crumbling. Because the sand and seaweed on the shore are changed by the rising and falling tides does it follow that the rocks will be removed? Because false religions crumble is it to be admitted that the true religion will also crumble and pass away? Take another specimen: "The old faiths do not, cannot, longer satisfy." What faiths does he include in this sweeping totality? Does he mean Christian faith? If he does he affirms what is not true and says what is disproved by millions on millions of Christian believers, who are so well content with the satisfaction their religion yields them that threats and bribes, persecutions and insidious flatteries are alike powerless to turn them aside from their faith in God.

In this country, where the support of religion is in the completest sense voluntary, there is one denomination of Christians which has a permanent investment of \$113,000,000, in church buildings and parsonages. Besides this they have invested \$26,000,000 in educational institutions and in their endowment—a total of \$139,000,000. The income of 197 institutions of learning in 1892 was \$1,652,000, and the total amount of gifts to these institutions was \$1,089,000. In 1892 for building and improving church property and in payment of church indebtedness they expended \$6,783,540; for support of ministers, \$10,314,798; for current expenses of 23,896 churches, \$2,614,208; for church benevolences, \$1,980,611. Massing these several amounts, a single Church in this land—the Methodist Episcopal—contributes annually \$22,782,316 to support their 23,896 churches and 197 institutions of learning. This showing represents an average permanent investment of nearly \$57 per member and an average contribution for the year of about \$9.33 per member. This does not look as if Christians were getting dissatisfied with the old faiths. People as a rule will not give at that rate, nor at any rate, to sustain and propagate a faith with which they are dissatisfied or a faith which fails to satisfy them. Take another view: In the Methodist Episcopal Church there are 2,442,627 members—a net increase of 62,940, or, allowing for 34,951 who died

during the year, an increase of 97,891 new members for 1892. The history of this Church is the history of many other Christian Churches. It certainly does not look as though fewer people attend church and more and more attend asylum and hospital meetings.

As a corollary to the statement of Mr. Ehrich that the old faiths fail to satisfy, which, as we have shown in the case of a single Church, is an unwarranted assertion, it is added, "No faith can satisfy when its acceptance is based on the stifling of human reason." The implication here is that Christian faith is based on the stifling of human reason. This is a violent assumption and is easily shown to be utterly untrue. Later in the paragraph it is stated in so many words, "An overwhelming majority of the children born of intelligent parents from this day on will refuse to accept the religious misbeliefs of their grandfathers." The expression, "religious misbeliefs of their grandfathers," is undefined. The meaning is obscured by the writer's usual way of putting his postulates. The inference that all the religious beliefs of the grandfathers of the present generation which do not accord with the reason of the grandchildren are misbeliefs is unjust and farfetched. All this is not only not a fair method of treating a subject, it is an utterly unfair mode of reasoning. In these first two paragraphs the unfairness is seen in their too inclusive and sweeping assumption of things as facts which are not admitted to be facts, but which remain simple and unproved assertions. Take the statement that "the old religions are crumbling." This is affirmed, as though it were undeniable truth, as to all religions. As to some religions it may be true; but it is an assumption unsupported by the facts to affirm, to imply, or to take for granted that Christianity is crumbling. The statement or implication is denied. The writer is challenged to the proof.

Another statement, made as though it were unquestionably true, is this: "Never have men attended church so little." This statement, while it may be partially true of some places and of certain times, taken as a general statement is untrue. The stress placed on it by the writer shows that he uses it in a general sense, and not in a restricted or qualified form. As a general fact church attendance is not falling off; it is, on the contrary, increasing. The last census shows a larger relative

increase in church membership than in the general population. In the last ten years the evangelical Churches of the country increased forty-two per cent, or seventeen per cent more than the whole population during the same time. It also shows greater activity and liberality in Christian propagandism, not at all congruous with the suggestion of decadence in attendance upon church meetings and with the alleged dissatisfaction with Christian faith. Equally fallacious is the statement that "never have men attended hospital and asylum meetings so assiduously," which is affirmed as though it denoted greater interest in them than in Christianity itself. But this is a great fallacy, for the reason that the men and women who assiduously attend hospital and asylum meetings are regular attendants upon church meetings, and almost all are earnest Christians. They are interested in these humanitarian movements because they are Christians; and their assiduity in meeting these calls of humanity's needs is a proof, not of their failing interest in Churches or of less earnest devotion to Christ's religion, but of their growing Christian zeal and faith. It proves their diligent faithfulness in attending Christian assemblies and their earnest and honest devotion to the teachings and example of Christ. Indeed, this activity in humanitarian movements is itself applied Christianity. From Mr. Ehrich's way of putting the case one would be led to suppose that infidels, backslidden Christians, freethinkers, agnostics, and theosophists were the only persons in this age who are engaged in promoting charitable and humane institutions, and that Christians generally, and especially orthodox Christians, were attempting to stay the progress of all charitable effort. The very reverse is the fact. The inspiration to the zeal and liberality displayed in humanitarian enterprises arise from the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The advent and resurrection anniversaries of the Lord Jesus are from year to year more and more esteemed and observed by all the people of Christian countries, and especially by the people of this country. Why is this so? Because men are more and more in sympathy with, and more and more strongly believe in, the immaculate and miraculous conception and the actual, identical resurrection of the Lord Jesus by the exertion of divine energy. In celebrating Christmas they do not pay their adorations at the shrine of a mere man. The claim of

Christ to divine honors, if Mr. Ehrich's idea is correct, was the greatest of conceivable deceptions. He claimed to be equal with God. He was one with the Father before the worlds existed. He says, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father." "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." If these claims which Jesus made and insisted on are not just, if he is not divine—and according to Mr. Ehrich he is not—then to render him the honors which Christians lavish upon him is to apotheosize the most gigantic impostor known to human history, whose enormity is unparalleled in God's universe. Those who keep Easter Day do not worship at the shrine of a dead Christ. "The Lord is risen indeed." Christians worship a living Redeemer, "declared to be the Son of God with power, . . . by the resurrection from the dead." "He burst the bars of death and vanquished all our foes." He ascended up on high, leading captivity captive and receiving gifts for men, "that the Lord God might dwell among them." Easter Day means a risen Christ. His followers know him and the power of his resurrection.

This prophet of the "religion for all time" says that "Christianity is going down. Jesus is rising higher and higher." This cannot be true. Jesus is Christianity. He is its source, its life, its essential substance and upholder. If he is rising the Christianity he came to found, to teach, to exemplify, and to which he imparts vitality and inherent force cannot be going down. "And I," said Jesus, "if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." He has been lifted up. He is drawing men. His attraction is seen and felt in all Christian lands. In heathen lands his power is known, and Moslem and Buddhist and Confucian alike are yielding to his divine drawing. The author says:

The old faiths do not, cannot, longer satisfy. No faith can satisfy when its acceptance is based on the stifling of human reason. At the close of our century the mind of man is vigorously bestirring itself. The word has gone forth that it is the duty of man—a duty made plain by the gift of reason—to doubt and to examine. Doubt and fearless examination mean approach

to the truth; and the truth cannot consort with the superstitions of the past. An overwhelming majority of the children born of intelligent parents from this day on will refuse to accept the religious misbeliefs of their grandfathers. Huxley and Lyell have not lived in vain.

If Christianity were destined to go down under the wholesale denunciations of those whose "wish is father to the thought" it would long ago have been destroyed by the boastful assertions of Voltaire, Thomas Paine, and their later imitators and followers, Ingersoll and Ehrich. Sweeping generalities are not arguments. They cannot terrify those against whom they are directed. As if Christ had been discarded and rejected by his disciples, and as if the outside world were demanding his replacement through an agency of an easy-going agnostic or theosophist, this author continues :

A cry has been heard for "a restored Christ ;" for the lovely, sweetly reasonable, all-loving, faith-inspiring, divine man, in place of the mythical, incomprehensible, doubt-compelling, human God. Simplicity is the character of all discovered natural laws. Simplicity will be the character of God's religion—no redemption mysteries, no vicarious offerings, no trinitarian subtleties.

"A restored Christ" indeed ! But he must not be the "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief" of Isaiah. He must not be the Christ of prophecy, on whom the Lord laid the iniquities of us all, who bare the sins of many, with whose stripes we are healed. None of that ! Let us no longer speak of "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." "Redemption mysteries" are not admissible here. Take other specimens :

Theoretically we ascribe superlative goodness to the Deity; but practically we do not credit him even with the loving instincts of a noble human soul. What earthly father—more especially if he needed nothing for himself—would desire his neighbor to bring him incense, praise, and sacrifice while one of his children lay neglected in sorrow, need, or distress ? . . . I maintain that from the remotest ages to our own times—from the first savage who offered up his enemy to the war-god to the Druid setting fire to great figures of plaited osier filled with human beings; to the Mohammedan slaying thousands with the shout, "Allah or the sword;" to the Aztec priest snatching out the heart of his sacrificial victims; to the Crusaders approaching the holy sepulchre after seventy thousand Moslems had been put to the sword; to the

pope's legate urging on the attack against the Albigenses, killing friend and foe with the cry, "Slay all, God will know his own;" to the holy inquisitor piling up the fagots around the unbeliever; to Charles V in the Netherlands, because of their religious opinions, hanging, beheading, burying alive, and burning over fifty thousand people; to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day and the driving of over half a million Huguenots from France; to the horrible persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts less than two hundred and fifty years ago; to the modern son of the Greek Church ruthlessly expelling thousands of Jews from Russia—all religion primarily devoted "to the glory of God" has left one long, hideous trail of suffering, of torture, and of blood. . . . I would turn man's eyes from heaven to earth, from God to man, from the saving of his soul to the simple service of man. . . . Believe if thou must in the Christian scheme of salvation, in an all-loving God who curses thousands of innocent generations because of the sin of Adam; who, repenting or relenting, in the shape of the Holy Ghost cohabits with a virgin and procreates his preexisting Son, whom he then has crucified, resurrected, and reseated on his right hand, to importune and cajole him not to punish or everlastingly burn his own erring children.

From the foregoing extracts it is quite obvious that their author has an intensely bitter and hateful animus against Christianity as taught and illustrated by Jesus. This disqualifies him from sitting as a judge on what he shows he had already hated, despised, and condemned before he assumed the rôle of judge. The one just and sufficient answer to the long list of outrages he cites from history, as to savage, Druid, Mohammedan, Aztec priest, the Crusaders, the holy Inquisition, the persecution of the Albigenses and Netherlanders, of the Quakers and Jews, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew, is that none of them is fairly attributable to Christianity. They were none of them the offspring of God's religion. They were neither inspired nor authorized by its letter or its spirit; and no one is more fully aware of this than the writer who adduced them. It is almost a surprise that he did not include the reign of terror in France, when a prostitute was deified as the goddess of liberty and half a million of lives were offered up in sacrifice to the rankest communism. The writer quotes Jesus as being the "lovegiver," in opposition to Moses, who was the "lawgiver." But Jesus himself sustains Moses and his law. Jesus says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill."

As illustrating still further the bitter, unreasoning animus the author bears toward Christianity look at this quotation :

I quarrel not with religious beliefs. Believe, if thou wilt, in the God of the Old Testament, who says to Saul, "Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass."

Why did not the author quote the overthrow of Pharaoh's army in the Red Sea as an instance of God's severity and overlook at the same time the hundreds of years of cruel bondage of the descendants of Abraham? If the writer had recalled the great flood which occurred in China a few years ago, in which two millions of human beings perished, he would have found therein an apparent instance of God's severity which would have fully matched the case of the Amalekites in rigor and far exceeded it in scope. If he had fully known the conditions of Amalek he might have found extenuation for the apparently ruthless command given to Saul which he declares to be so horrible to him. If he had not possessed a bitter animus to gratify he might have found, even in the Old Testament, things to challenge his readers' admiration, as, for example, the purity and faithfulness of Samuel's character; the virtue of Joseph; the temperance and conscientious moral integrity of Daniel and his Hebrew associates; the magnanimity of David even to this same Saul and toward the three brave men who, in peril of their lives, went through the enemy's lines to bring him water from the well of Bethlehem. He might have found something which would represent in better light the God of the Old Testament if he had given the beautiful account of Ruth and described the noble heroism of Esther. When a man so far forgets himself as to pervert the plainest facts of history in his denunciations of Christianity he discounts his impartiality as a critic, his judicial temper as a judge, and his qualifications as the prophet of a new instauration.

His representation of what Christianity teaches as to God's cursing thousands of innocent children for the sin of Adam are as utter perversions of the real teachings of Christianity about Adam's sin as it is possible to imagine. If he had read the Scriptures half as carefully as he has perverted them he would have seen it stated, in Paul's writings, that in Christ Jesus

provision is made for freeing the children from accountability for Adam's sin. If he had read Moses he would have discovered, in Deut. xxiv, 16, a commandment very different from his perverted interpretation of the law of hereditary liability for ancestral sins:

The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin.

This is Paul's version of this subject (Rom. v, 12-19):

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offense, so also is the free gift: for if through the offense of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offenses unto justification. For if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

The blasphemous caricature Mr. Ehrich makes of the Holy Ghost, of the Son, of the Father, and of the importuning and cajoling of God by the Son is more than absurd—it is indecent. After writing this libel upon the Almighty he adds that to him “this is blasphemous.” It is indeed! And why, except to gratify a malignant animus, did he utter it? It out-Ingersolls Ingersoll himself. It even exceeds Thomas Paine's ribaldry in his *Age of Reason* in the assault he makes upon the character of the female disciples of the Lord. It will take a stronger hand than Mr. Ehrich's to overturn the old faith of Christianity, now known in the whole world. Until he sets aside the old he will make but a meager showing in inaugurating the “religion for all times.” In a word, this gentleman has undertaken a big enterprise.

Besides the unfair spirit of this moral knight errant his thought is less of soul-saving than of body-helping. The soul is the highest part of man's nature. "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost." Man's soul is lost, depraved, and on its way to the perdition of ungodly men. The most urgent thing is to get this human soul out of the gutter and bring it to the power, the love, and the saving grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. Evidently, Mr. Ehrich does not recognize sin as a great evil, demanding expiation and needing removal by a new, celestial birth. Sin, to say the mildest thing he could, is a misfortune, a sad mistake. Mr. Ehrich says:

I would turn man's eyes from heaven to earth, from the saving of his soul to the simple service of other souls. Here is the contrast between the religion of the past and of the future:

LOVE

GOD,	MAN,
HEAVEN,	EARTH,
HEREAFTER.	NOW.

This is Mr. Ehrich's own definition of the new religion he seeks to inaugurate. There is no thought of God, of heaven, of the hereafter. Instead we are to love man, earth, and the present. Take another sample:

The religion which will yet prevail among men will hang "all the law and all the prophets" on one single commandment. It will demand that man shall love his neighbor more than himself; and the simple tenet of the all-embracing, world-sufficing religion will be, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." And "neighbor" will mean, not only the nigh-dweller, but everything that breathes and blossoms in the universe.

After all this flourish of trumpets against the old religion of the prophets and of Christ the picture he draws of the future under the guidance of his new religion is precisely that which is described by Old Testament prophecy and realized in the modern history of Christianity as the effects of Christ's religion. Prophecy says of Christ's kingdom:

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. (Isa. xi, 9.)

Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness

shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever. And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting places; when it shall hail, coming down on the forest; and the city shall be low in a low place. (Isa. xxxii, 16-19.)

There are several fatal barriers in the way of this latest venture of infidelity which must be overcome before even a footing for it can be found. Let us ask:

I. What is the fault with Christianity? What evil hath it done? What good hath it not projected and performed? Can better principles of action be found than these?

We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbor for his good to edification. (Rom. xv, 1, 2.)

Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. (Rom. xii, 17-21.)

Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. (Rom. xiii, 8-10.)

Is there any vice which can claim to find its sanction in Christianity? Is there any virtue which does not find root and support in Christianity? What plea or pretext can any one offer for seeking to supersede Christian faith and Christian living and to set up a newly projected religion, which can find place only by uprooting and overthrowing the system of Christianity which God planted in the earth and which has had such flowering and fruitage of good to man and glory to God?

II. Does this propounder of a new religion hold any authenticating credentials? Where are they? What are they? Can he show us any signs or right by which he claims authority as a prophet to teach a new religion? The prophet of this new unfaith and miscalled religion lacks credentials. Who vouches

for him? Let him show us the authority by which he says and does these things.

III. What power can Mr. Ehrich bring to the enforcement of his new law of loving others more than we love ourselves? If, in all the generations of dreary failure of the old law of loving our neighbor as ourselves, there has been wanting the necessary enforcing motive to induce its better fulfillment and to give humanity the help needed for its uplifting and improvement, what is the outlook for the success of a law which demands far stronger love and far greater helpfulness? The enforcement of the old law is urged by obligations of justice, gratitude, and piety. What motive exists or can exist which shall embrace the wider scope of this proposed new law? Where is the motive? Who can discover it? How can it be applied? A law will not enforce itself. Who then can enforce this?

IV. If these difficulties of lack of motives and lack of power to apply them could be set aside, and if the prospect for the enforcement of the new law were too obvious for denial or doubt, wherein could be shown the superiority of the new law of loving one's neighbors more than one loves himself? How much would it develop of self-reliance and self-help if others cared more for us than they care for themselves, more for us than we care for ourselves. It is said that the honey bees in the tropics will not lay by stores of honey, because no winter there enforces such necessity. This, however, is a mistake, as the writer knows from long observation. But if others provide for us more than for themselves, more than we provide for ourselves, then it would appear that all motive and opportunity for our doing for ourselves would be taken away.

V. Another stubborn difficulty in the way of this new religion for all time is more real than apparent. Socialism seeks to reconstruct society so as to make all men equal in property, position, and influence. Destroy the distinctions between good and evil by overthrowing the law of God, and the path of socialism is unobstructed. This effect may come in either or both of two ways: (1) By overthrowing God's authority, failing to recognize his claims to our reverent obedience to him, and so uprooting conscience; or (2) by destroying the second table of the law, which teaches and maintains the rights of property in

the individual man. The law of God and the religion of Christ are the basis and bulwark of our civil, political, and social institutions. The scheme of anarchy is the utter destruction of all existing institutions and the deification of humanity. Both those dangerous theories, whether so intended or not, are included in Mr. Ehrich's "religion for all times." Adopt his ideas, and we are landed where all infidelity inevitably tends, namely, in the deification of humanity and in the bitterest and most malignant hostility to God. It is the sheerest infidelity, the old cry of the red-handed assassins of the French Revolution, "Liberty, equality, fraternity—or death."

From the tribune of the French Jacobins Robespierre said: "I am ready to die at any moment for France." It will hardly be claimed that Robespierre was a saint; yet as is well known he proposed a new scheme of religion—that of the *Être Suprême*, "the basis of rational republican religion." When he was arrested he was not so ready to die for France. He resisted the officers, compelling them to shoot him; his jaw was broken, and a bandage under his chin and over his head held his lower jaw in place. A woman stood near as the tumbrils were passing to the place of execution. She had lost several sons by the decree of the bloody triumvirate—Danton, Marat, and Robespierre. As Robespierre passed on his way to the scaffold she exclaimed audibly: "Murderer of all my kindred! your agony fills me with joy. Descend to hell, covered with the curses of every mother in France!"* When he was placed under the guillotine the bandage was removed. His jaw fell; he uttered a shriek. The blade descended. And so perished this founder of a new religion; while now, just a century after his death, the religion he superseded still flourishes as never before in all its long history.

* Alison's *History of Europe from the Commencement of the French Revolution to the Restoration of the Bourbons*, vol. iii, p. 353.

Thomas H. Parme

ART. VII. — PANTHEISM'S DESTRUCTION OF BOUNDARIES. — PART II.

As far as the scope of this article allows us we think we have shown conclusively that the pantheistic tendency of our age and the evolution doctrine, which is its legitimate daughter, have in large measure effaced the boundaries and are bent upon their entire destruction. Facing now the question, What dangers threaten us by this destruction of boundaries? we consider first the lesson which history teaches. For under like influences a state of society has been developed upon a broad scale for centuries together on the banks of the Ganges, and in part, also, in the Celestial Kingdom; and afterward both gnosticism and mysticism have inspired smaller circles with the same spirit. This is to us a beacon at sea, for a wreck is a fair image of what these states and circles show. In India's beautiful domain lives one of the most richly endowed races, profound in spirit, mighty in numbers, in the midst of tropical wealth—a people which in everything competes with our Western nations and may even exceed us. And yet that people is asleep, has long ceased to make history; and, almost without effort, Islam first, then the Mongols, and lastly England have conquered this royal people. However energetically a Keshub Chunder Sen lately organized his propaganda in a most masterly way to arouse his people from their deathly slumbers, he utterly failed. And the human ideal of the *Yogi* Hindoo still consists of a benighted hermit immovably staring into the sun, his loins girded with a serpent's skin, his naked breast covered by coarse hair, wild shrubs growing up about him, and a songless bird building its somber nest upon his holy shoulders.

And what has become of Lao-Tse's beautiful fancies in China? Mr. Balfour, who learned to know Taoism by personal observation, complains in his South Place Institute lecture that Taoism has lapsed into "a low and despicable superstition, into a religion in its worst and lowest sense, a *hocus-pocus* and an imposition." And when in the province of Kiang-si he called on the *Chang-Fien Shih*, or high priest of this sect, his holiness showed him in his beautiful palace to a room filled with earthen jars, carefully corked and sealed, in which by his magic power

he had confined hundreds of evil spirits. The self-degradation and cruel immorality of the Valentinians and Ophites among the Gnostics needs no new demonstration. The moral destruction which this self-same mystical pantheism wrought among the Beghards and their consorts, and in our country among the Antinomians, is well known from history. It all ended in the "rehabilitation" of the flesh, as Hundeshagen calls it. The common system is, "*quod Deus formaliter est, omne id quod est.*" Thus the boundary between good and evil falls away. "The will of God determines our disposition, and should a man commit even a thousand deadly sins by the force of such predisposition he need not even wish that he had not committed them." The lesson of history is sufficiently alarming. Feuerbach once wrote: "The eternal, supersensual death is God;" and, indeed, everything seems here to pass away in national and moral death. Of course this needs delineation, in broad outline, at least, which we will do in the order of our personal, ecclesiastical, and political life.

A thoughtful student who had suffered himself to drift with the tempting current of this stream prefaces his translation of one of Herbart's works with these significant words: "I allowed myself to drift with it because it promised my soul peace and rest. And what has it brought me? A feeling of powerlessness and of heaviness. Then I turned to Herbart and regained that buoyancy of spirit which was fast failing me." We understand this well; for when the boundary between God and the world falls away, and in the Holy Trinity we can no longer worship, the fullness of the richest personal life, the mainspring of our own personal existence, is broken. He who deals with God as his holy Friend deepens the traits of his own nature; and Herbart expresses it beautifully: "No longer to feel the need of this Friend were devotion to such loneliness as only egoism creates in the midst of society, making the dwelling of man a wilderness." No strong character can be formed when the etcher, who should deeply mark the lines in the metal, has his graver taken from him by the dreamer, who dissolves every line. Character demands strength of conviction coupled with firmness of will, a deep sense of a calling in life, bound up with faith of success in this calling; and these factors of our personality refuse to do service when the stability of lines in our con-

ception of life vanishes away and when there is no more faith in any known truth, nor in law, which governs the will, nor in God, who calls us to a lifework and who makes everything subserve its accomplishment. Underneath your feet the fountains rise higher, and from above the rain pours down to soak the roadbed, which was once well graveled and firm, and turn it into mud, where walking becomes stumbling and sliding. Hence the complaint, which was never more general than in our days, about the dearth of character, of impressive personality, and of men of iron will. In sooth, we need be no "admirers of the past" to stand aggrieved at the dullness of the faces about us, at their weakness of expression and want of manly power, in comparison with those portrayed on Rembrandt's canvases.

No, we do not look down with self-conceit upon agnosticism; and when we hear Tyndall reverently say, "Standing before this power which from the universe forces itself upon me, I dare not do other than speak poetically of a Him, a Spirit, or even a Cause; its mystery overshadows me, but it remains a mystery," then this agnostic reverence touches us more deeply than the Kantian refrain of God, virtue, and immortality. But forget not that the clearness of our human consciousness is here at stake; the clearness of our thinking becomes dimmed. In England science is defined as the statistics of what is measured, weighed, and numbered. "*Bene docet qui distinguit*" ("He teaches well who distinguishes well") is the rule of discipline from which our thinking, if it is to be sound, may not escape; but here the rule is made to read, "*Bene docet qui omnia bene permiscet*" ("He teaches well who mixes all things well"). And, as mentioned above, Hegel had to invent a new logic for this amalgamating process of thought. Before this cloudy manner of thinking the strength of conviction recedes. Everything clothes itself with the garb of modesty, which in reality is naught but hesitation and uncertainty, until in the end the thirst for knowledge turns its "love glance" upon the not-knowing, and Du Bois Reymond proclaims his "*ignorabimus*," which is followed by the agnostic axiom of Spencer. In this way it is not merely philosophy that languishes and the horizon of science itself which becomes narrow, but in practical life skepticism takes possession again of the human heart and draws the clouds ever thicker across the clearness of our vision, until

in the end that spark of holy enthusiasm is extinguished which can glow only in higher latitudes beneath the azure sky.

Sport is excellent, and we felt flattered when recently our batters and bowlers returned from England laden with honors; but it would cause us greater joy if we discovered among our youth enthusiasm for the honor of our history, for patriotism, and for a holy conviction in things lovely, pure, and beautiful. But alas! here, too, the erasure of boundaries stands offensively in our way, especially in the spheres of morality. The word "sin" became too pungent; "holy" was replaced by "brave," "brave" by "decent," and "decent" by "neat," a word descriptive of dress, not of personality. And how can it be otherwise, when the noblest thinkers of our age have reduced good and evil to a difference of degree; when the law for moral life is allowed to be fixed autonomously by the subject himself, by which every moral idea is robbed of its absolute character; when the æsthetic is exalted at the cost of the ethic, and the doctrine is proclaimed from our housetops that the sensual life also must demand satisfaction for its claims? Is the boundary between truth and falsehood still fixed? Is it still known what honor is? What is right if it be not the right of the stronger? Who distinguishes between theft and property? Where, above all, is the boundary which distinguishes guilt from fate, imputability from irresistible inclination? Has not Buckle statistically shown how each year there must take place so many divorce suits, so many accidents, so many murders with the dagger, so many others with the pistol, and so many, again, by strangulation? It is all the one process, which, restlessly turning the wheel of life, hurries it on from that which is real to the ideal. Why, then, be surprised that excise duties of a less honorable sort are ever enlarged; that the dissolute woman presses her claims with ever-increasing shamelessness; and that our sturdy Dutch integrity, which was once proverbial in the market of the world, buries itself in its legends?

Israel once sang, "I love the Lord, because he hath heard my voice and my supplications." Our age raves with altruism, because its heart is too faint for real egoism. And when the *noumena* withdraw themselves in the far distance and, at a still greater distance, disappear behind the ever-changing phenomena, and a *pontifex* is no longer near to bridge this

distance, nor a Curtius to fill this abyss with himself, then a poetry is still spoken of which with its thousand forms will brood upon this infinite void. But they forget that all poetry, to find its symbols, must start from the antithesis which exists between the spiritual and the natural. And therefore look at those who now occupy the seats upon Parnassus, where Vondel once shone, and Bilderdijk won his laurels, and where Da Costa lost himself in worship. Against this mystic poetry Herbart wrote: "The concept of God as the Father of men should be retained in its strength. A purely theoretical concept is worthless; an idea is bare of comfort." However, we do not satirize our age; God has infinitely enriched it, and in many respects it far exceeds the age that went before it. There are many worthy people now, many lovable people, who do not wear the purple, but who constantly remind us of it; but we miss the powerful figures, the great men, the stars of first magnitude. How have the stars, like those in Leyden, been extinguished one after another! Who is Caprivi compared with Von Bismarck? When Gladstone dies who will succeed him? Alas! the dynamic weakening can no longer be denied. *Epigonoï* have taken the places of heroes, and at their feet crowd the multitudes weary of life, whose satiety betrays itself in the dullness of their eyes. See how listlessness stares us in the face; how suicide attracts; how the number of our insane is ever on the increase. And when we think how this century began with placing man on a pedestal, higher than ever before, and how in closing it leaves him behind so weary of life, then does not this century seem like the soap bubble which glittered in the light as the boy blew it out on the air, but which, as he blew too hard, condensed into one unsightly drop?

Europe has twice known such periods of spiritual atrophy, once under Roman rule, and again at the close of the Middle Ages; and both times the Church of Christ caught the paralytic by the hand and lifted him up so that he walked and life once more coursed freely through his veins. Hence the question arises, Will the Church of Christ be able to do this again? And is there no cause for increasing anxiety when, by this blurring and eventual destruction of boundaries, we see the Church of Christ inwardly ebbing away her life and outwardly reduced to an ever-narrower ecclesiasticism? If there is one

who protests against the idea of evolution it is He who came down from the Father of lights in order to reveal himself as God in the flesh. Christ is *the* miracle. It is Bethlehem that opens a branch in the line of human genealogy. "Immanuel's resurrection" breaks through the order of nature. And when the Church of Christ starts out upon her mission in the world her deeply marked characteristic is not to be of the world. Hence the Church of Christ stands *ipso facto* opposed to the unity dream of the pantheistic process, and denies that salvation can ever come by evolution to a world lost in sin. This is her character and her nature. Abandonment of this antithesis is the sacrifice of her character. She must hold up this dualism in the face of the unregenerated world. And as soon as the boundary is blurred which separates her from the natural life she ceases to be the Church of Christ. This, of course, is the very thing opposed by the pantheistic tendency of our age, and no less sharply by the principle of evolution. Pantheism cannot triumph unless the stumbling-block of the cross be taken out of the way; the evolution theory cannot exist if that notion of Golgotha be not removed. Hence the assertion by a German philosopher, that "where culture breaks through there can be no more Church." Hence Hegel's statement that the State, as "the divine will in the present," must make the Church subservient to its end, until finally she be dissolved in the State. Hence Rothe, who was himself a theologian, threw away his honor and committed treason to the Church, by prophesying her rapid declension and disappearance in the State; and from this, no less, comes the cool determination of the leading jurists in Germany to forge the shackles by which to chain the Church. By a circle of almost thirty professors of law, among whom Ihering was one, the doctrine has been published that the Protestant Church "is a purely worldly organization," and, stronger still, "that, rightly considered in the sense of modern ecclesiastical law, the Church is only a part of the world." This shows whither this erasure of boundaries leads us; and we are no longer surprised at the boldness of Professor Lorn in writing that the Church of Christ is nothing more than a *Religions-Verein*, and that the present relation between State and Church "rests on the principle of the sovereignty of the State, to which even the Church

is subjected." This would not signify anything if the watchers at the boundaries were found at their post, or, at least, in the camp of the Church. But it is well known that the opposite is true. They who rise up for its defense are put outside the boundary line. Every boundary of confession is wiped out by the public proclamation of liberty of doctrine. The Church must be as like a worldly society as one drop of water is like another. Even though Christ be denied by all the people it must still be named the people's Church. He who believes in no Father in heaven may proclaim unto the people his philosophy as Gospel. And, when hope is fostered that "believing" theologians will rebel against such repulsive contradictions, the *Vermittelungs-theologen* of every predilection may be seen willfully wiping out the confessional boundary and adding ever more freely their philosophic wine to the pure juice of life, as if bent upon the entire destruction of that deeply marked boundary line of our Christian mysteries which separates God's holy revelation from our darkened reason.

No resistance, therefore, can be looked for from this quarter against what Hermann calls "the spiritual disturbance" of our age. As long as a spiritual *tohu va bohu* remains the lauded ideal among these leaders no invincible principles of morality, no deeply inculcated convictions of soul, nor any fixed, general ideas can come to our people from their ecclesiastical guides. But the restoration of a fixed point of departure, of a religious and moral "place where to stand," in view also of the social storm-foretold by our political meteorologists, is the only saving means by which a footing may be regained by our generation. Recover the faith in a last judgment, and as long as we hold this faith we may calmly witness the constant violation of right in the earth, which is practiced not merely by public offenders, but by legislative bodies and by judges. For our sense of right is secure in that of God, which he himself shall one day avenge. Proceed, however, upon the half-truth of the pantheist, that "the world's history is the world's judgment," and we must secularize our sense of right; that is, we may recognize no longer any law except that which amid constant changes the authorities create and maintain. And by this fluctuating notion of right (since the *jus constitutum* is never at rest) we destroy the majesty of law in the minds of those who live under it.

This has been accomplished. Von Stahl confines absolute right within the boundaries of our human economy, and does not see how it has its primordial rise in religion, and how all ethical right is rooted in this religious right of God over his creature. All this is the result of Kant's partially correct endeavor to interpret right as the shield of liberty, or of Fichte's effort to assign its rise to the struggle between the double ego. With Hegel, therefore, it is put down as a morality of a lower order. According to Ihering it is born from an "end-impulse of society." In Darwin fashion it is reconstructed by others as the mechanical product of historic and external factors; while the later Herbartians perceive it as the cruse of oil which the seaman pours upon the seething waves for the salvation of ship and crew. But, endless as these representations of the origin of right may be, the idea is common to them all that it is only by the State, as the instrument of society, that absolute right receives its sanction. It is too bad that, with the exception of Von Stahl, none of these men hold to the immutability of State authority. The scepter of authority is swayed now by one party and again by another—Napoleon is superseded by Bourbon, Bourbon overcome by Orleans; and in this wise is formed the series of those who make themselves master in turn of authority in the State, because for a while they are the stronger. He therefore rules the State who actually gets the power in hand; and in this stronger one who establishes right and law, the right of the stronger triumphs, not merely *de facto*, but likewise in theory. And by this the boundary falls away which separates the authorities, as the powers ordained of God, from the people, who, by the same God, are appointed to be subject unto them. Both are dissolved in the one all-sufficient State. The State takes the place of God. The State becomes the highest power, and the fountain head also of right. The higher powers exist no longer for the sake of sin; but a State is the highest ideal of human society—a State, before whose apotheosis every knee must bow, by whose grace alone we live, and to whose word all must be subject. And when in this wise the boundaries are destroyed between the authorities and the people, between the authorities and Him whose servant they are, and consequently between right as a divine ordinance and right as a magisterial command, nothing remains but the one single State, making

provision for everything, in which all human energy seeks its ideal development.

A great danger lurks in this ; for, however eloquently the boundary has been reasoned away between the authorities who rule and the people who must obey, that duality does exist, a duality from which of necessity is born a twofold strife, the strife of the State evermore to increase its power over the people, and the strife on the part of the people to make themselves masters over the State. Absolutism from one side and anarchy from the other stare us in the face ; and the question has already been raised whether constitutional public law has not served its time, and whether the parliamentary system has not outlived its usefulness. The next step is to found upon the ruins of our civil liberty the government of Schleiermacher's *virtuosos*, that is, of those who are learned and genial—a repetition of our old regent's-misery, clothed this time in the scientific garb.

But against this, of course, the people rebel. The boundaries have been destroyed ; why then longer render homage to him who is high and declare those who are low politically under age ? Are not rich and poor an antithesis, which, since all boundaries have been effaced, offensively disturbs your much-lauded harmony ? Why render obedience, when authority finds no more support in the conscience and right is no longer founded upon eternal principles ? Power has its rise in the State, and we are the people ; we, the millions, constitute the State ; hence ours is the power, the power also to recreate the right, and we will enact that right in such a form as shall satisfy all our senses. And what can you do, ye mighty ones of earth, ye that extol in song the State-apotheosis, how oppose this wild cry of nihilism ? By the conscience ? But that you have disjointed. By the moral senses ? But these you have set afloat. By the fear of the final judgment ? At this you scoff yourselves. By the majesty of law ? This you have violated. By the influence of the Church ? This you have destroyed. No, nothing, nothing remains to you but your power. Upon actual, positive power your entire building has been raised. And with your power you may still offer resistance for a long time, for your forces are stronger than ever (and fearful havoc they may create) ; but woe unto you when in the end this poison begins to work among your armies and as a cancer feeds upon their vitals. For

then you are undone. Then these people, armed by you, before the sun has set upon that day of vengeance shall with a single stroke dispel your enchanting power, and, while crushing you to the earth, proclaim it loud and far that boundaries are no more, that all has become evolution, and that they but inaugurate a movement which could not fail in your pantheistic process!

Max Müller once sketched the *nirvana* of the *yoga* in the picture of a lamp which was being extinguished. Toward such a social *nirvana* we shall see the nations of Europe move, unless something be done to stop the weakening of boundaries. When, in the human body, the boundary is disturbed between the tissue of the veins and the flesh of the muscles, then, with an *ἀνάγκη* (necessity) which is irresistible, there follows the decomposition of the corpse.

France was not saved twenty years ago by the injudicious supply of arms to the mob, nor by Gambetta's wild hue and cry that not an inch of ground nor a stone of the stronghold should be surrendered. No escape was possible through the iron network with which Von Moltke had invested France, and in the old imperial town of Frankfort the Gaul capitulated. But this did not finish France; for when, at length, it wisely took copy from Prussia's example after the battle at Jena, and forcibly restrained its chauvinism and exerted its utmost efforts in home discipline and recovery of strength, it soon appeared possessed of so much energy of national life that Germany's emperor already feels uneasy and has called out ninety thousand more men per annum for the better protection of his frontiers. Is there no lesson in this for us, when, having shown the erasure of boundaries and the dangers which it threatens, we face the final question, What resistance may we offer?

In sooth, the present condition of believing Christianity is very like that of France after Sedan and Gravelotte. The assault made upon us has not been successfully beaten off in any single point. Stronghold after stronghold has been abandoned. Treason has been committed, time after time, within our own ranks. Intoxicated with transports of joy, the enemy prophesies the near dawn of the day of our entire defeat. And he is quite correct. With shame we must acknowledge the cowardliness and lamentable want of tact which have characterized our Christian conduct during these last hundred years in

this strife against unbelief. And if any one thing is able to strengthen our faith that One greater than we has battled for our people it is the surprising fact that, in spite of such ill-directed resistance, our strength has not waned, but has grown intensely stronger.

We have nothing to say of the doctrinaire. God be praised! the last echoes have died away of the hollow phrases whereby stupid self-sufficiency deemed itself able to vanquish a Strauss, to disarm a Darwin, and to drive a Kuenen out of the fight. These were the scoffing bulletins of the princeling who gathered bullets at Wissembourg, the boastful call of men utterly ignorant of the enemy, both in his earnestness and in the strength of his weapons. And, as it always happens with the boastful pride of cowards, of the ten who protested then so loudly perhaps eight now appear among the leaders in infidelity. No, when we consider what resistance has been offered we refer not to that ineffectual skirmishing, but rather to the earnest three-fold effort put forth to save the threatened position, whereby men gathered under the banner of the apologist, the compromiser, or the amphibian.

Apologetics have first been tried. As often as the outworks were attacked the defenders of Christian truth hastened to the breach to answer each shot from the enemy with a ball from their own cannon. Wherever the enemy showed himself they crept after him in trenches. Though often repulsed with bleeding heads they still held firm, and, with a sturdy patience which compels respect, lance crossed lance, dagger sharpened dagger, and blow followed blow. But, in spite of this defense, they gained nothing; for on the heels of one host of objections, which were upheld for a moment at the most, another army of still heavier critical grievances loomed up at once. Meanwhile they permitted the enemy to prescribe the plan of campaign, fell in consequence into hopeless confusion, and in the end were cut off from their own basis of operation. The lamentable course of that apologetic resistance is well known. A rustic militia measured itself against a Prussian guard. And hence the endless series of concessions, till at length the bravest hero lost the fire of his eye and all courage from his weary heart in the grief of disappointment.

No wonder, therefore, that, in view of this sad spectacle, our

Vermittelungs-theologen felt themselves more attracted by the role of the *Mittelsmann*, as our German neighbors say. All too trustfully our apologists had entered the unequal strife; these with deeper vision, gentler feeling, and riper philosophy correctly saw how unproductive such clumsy striving must be, and, therefore, peace-loving as they were by nature, they rather employed a spiritual polity. So they entered the field preceded by the white flag of truce, and, as the enemy drew near, ordered the trumpeter to blow a *pax vobiscum*, and readily assured the men of modern views of their warm sympathy with their modernity and of their deep dislike for the old school; yes, that they would like nothing better than the honor of marching with these moderns, if only the name of Christ could be embroidered on the banner and the cross ornament the top of their standard. And the success of their polity was naturally brilliant. "Modern-orthodox," a genuine pantheistic compound, was the adopted name of the new auxiliary. And we behold the heroes who were to rescue our faith do service as sappers, charged with the clearing away of "orthodox obstacles."

However (whether under the influence of De Genestet who shall say?), the compromise method soon ceased to enchant; and then, at length, we beheld how men gathered under the shield of the amphibian. Jacobi had been a heretic in his intellect, but a believer at heart. If, then, this dualism in feeling of Jacobi were supported by the philosophic monism of Herbart and by the *Erkenntnisstheorie* of Lotze, how safe the position would be, how easy would be their movements, and how freely would they hunt with criticism to their very hearts' content, and still engage in prayer with the pious wife! That was it. Head and heart, the intellect and the will, must be divorced; *Werth-urtheil* was the magic motto which would save from every dilemma. And thus arose that generation of spiritual amphibians who plunged so playfully into the depths of the modern waters, and again would nimbly scale the river-bank to graze in the sweet clover of the hallowed Christian pasture. But there was no defense in this. A dualism of principles gives no system. And, moreover, our Christianity is a revealed, historic religion, which at every point of the way inexorably faces us with ideas which demand analysis and with facts which must find room in our cosmos.

However highly, therefore, we appreciate the intention of these three classes of defenders, and however much we owe to their study of detail, we cannot be incorporate with them—not with the apologetes, because no plea can avail when reason is both defendant and judge; not with the *Mittelsmänner*, because they exhaust their strength in a monstrous marriage, and “hybrids do not propagate;” and not with our spiritual dualists, because logic and ethics have but one consciousness at their command, and all such spiritual divorces must end in hypertrophy of the head coupled with atrophy of the heart.

An altogether different and much safer method was employed wherever resistance proved effectual. God calls Abraham out of Ur, separates Israel from the nations, and thus, in real life, casts up a dam against the flood of paganism. Christ comes and forms in Israel a following of his own, which, by separation from the world, is being trained to vanquish the spirit of the world. In the sixteenth century similar resistance was offered by men who withdrew their forces within self-created bounds to regain strength, in order, by life's reality and deeds, and not by theories and phrases, to strengthen themselves for the strife which awaited them. In the self-same manner Von Stein rallied Prussia after Jena and France has restored her strength. And, as regards our struggle, they who adhere to the Christian faith and appreciate the danger of the destruction of boundaries must begin by drawing a circle about themselves within which to develop a life of their own, of which life, thus constituted, they must give account, and so to increase strength for the strife which is upon us.

This is the only method which, as often as correctly applied, has stood the test of fire, which Rome never abandoned, and which is the only rational one again to pursue. How have pantheism and evolution risen to be so powerful? Certainly not because of Kant or Hegel, Darwin or Haeckel, for no single man can transform the spirit of his time if he be not himself a child of his time. No, the general mood of mind, the temper of soul, the inclination of heart, all of life down to its deepest impulses, had risen up in rebellion at the close of the last century against the boundaries appointed by God; pantheism was in the air; and Hegel and Darwin, as children of their age, only hastened the birth of the monstrosity, which our age had long carried

under its heart. There is no need, therefore, to exhaust our strength in a conflict of words. So powerful a movement of life can be faced with hope of success only by the movement of an antithetic life. In opposition to those who efface the boundaries both in life and consciousness a life must be developed with deeply marked character lines; the floating fogs of pantheism must be confronted with the clear and positive utterances of a truly embraced confession; and in like manner the exaltation of the world's *dictum* must be opposed by the absolute authority of the Scriptures. Thus an independent basis of operation will be regained and a reality will originate which already as such exercises an influence upon our inspiration. Thus only will a fortified line present itself at the front which will render it possible to postpone a giving of battle until quietly and definitely the forces are developed, the weapons sharpened, and the ranks well exercised. Thus also is revived that holy comradeship, that confidence in one's own cause, and that enthusiasm for the colors of the banner which double the strength of every army.

That this system demands great sacrifice is not denied. It compels an entire break with much that is attractive. It cuts off all intercourse with the nobler heathen, however fascinating that may be. A great price must be paid for it; and, worse yet, it will cause the resolute man all manner of family inconvenience, and will render it difficult to find a position in life for the support of oneself and family. But with the Scriptures in hand we declare that this sacrifice must be laid on the altar. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." Christ came not to bring peace in a pantheistic sense, but to make discord among men, that is, to establish a boundary which none can remove between those who touch the hem of his garment and those who reject him. And therefore this system must not be accused of exclusivism. Of this they are guilty who on their own responsibility establish a false boundary that separates things which belong together. But this reproach will never touch the system we commend, for at the very point where the boundary is drawn by our deepest conviction of life the pigeonhole system lies condemned, and broken down is every false wall of separation. This system has as little in common with the recluse who shuns the light of the outside world.

Living in a house of one's own by no means forbids a going abroad in every pathway of life. And, as we said above, behind our line we desire to arm ourselves more completely that we may be the better ready for the strife.

Of one claim, we grant, we can make no surrender; it must be born within us—that we believe. Even as we are stabbed by those who announce themselves as the enlightened and the civilized and label us as the “nonthinking part of the nation,” so they must suffer us to wound them as often as we distinguish ourselves as “believers” from the “nonbelieving part of the nation.” But this is the very thing in question. It is the protection of that boundary for which we stake our very life. They deny the fall by sin; for us it stands firm and fixed. And therefore they cannot recognize a boundary which is established by the entrance of grace, while for us this transition is one from death unto life.

We are taught by the word of God that sin not merely spoiled the will and corrupted our nature, but that it also darkened the understanding. On the contrary, the palingenesis not merely renews the will and transforms our nature, but also sheds a light of its own into our inner consciousness. He who believes receives not merely another impression of life, but is also differently affected in the world of thought, which difference cannot be better interpreted than by Augustine's celebrated *interrogatorium*. Augustine had himself been a pantheist at first, and had not been able to conceive God otherwise than as hiding in the *ὕλη*. But when, led by the Spirit of God, he turned away from the *Jesus patibilis* of the Manichæans and fixed his gaze upon the Man of sorrows, then, with the self-same ears with which he had heard the sound of the particles of light in leaf and stem, he now heard this entirely different speech of the creation. Then, as he writes in his *Confessions*,

I asked the earth, and it answered, “I am not He;” and whatsoever are therein made the same confession. I asked the sea and the deeps and the creeping things that lived, and they replied. “We are not thy God; seek higher than we.” I asked the breezy air, and the universal air with its inhabitants answered, “Anaximenes was deceived; we are not thy God.” I asked the heavens, the sun, moon, and stars; “Neither,” said they, “are we the God whom thou seekest.” And I answered unto all things which stand about the door of my flesh, “Ye have told me concerning my God

that ye are not he; tell me something about him." And with a loud voice they exclaimed, "It is He who hath made us!"

In the grandeur of the faith Augustine was now another man, and therefore he heard differently and thought differently. Then also he heard the voice of God addressing him in the Scriptures; and our circle holds this in common with Monica's great son. We also bow ourselves before that Word; and therefore that Word also draws the boundary line between us who camp behind our line and those who live beyond it. We are often told that we cannot hold this opinion in sincerity; the pious housewife may, but not the man of science. And he who throws away his respect exclaims, "Ye are deceivers!" Of course, they who are not stupid must agree with such wisdom or else have their integrity suspected. We are familiar with such ways. But this much must be granted: faith in the Scriptures can never be the result of criticism, for then no one could ever have believed, as criticism is not yet a finished science. Moreover, how could the Scriptures ever excite faith among the humble laity who understand nothing of criticism? If then it is very true that in the Scriptures there arise many difficulties and objections which have by no means been straightened out, this does not delay us, this does not trouble us, since we stand on other ground. In 1794 it was Kant himself who denounced "*die Keckheit der Kraftgenies*," which deemed itself to have outgrown this norm of faith, and added these weighty words:


If ever the Scriptures which we now have should lose their authority, a similar authority could never more arise, for a miracle like that of the Scripture authority cannot repeat itself, simply because the loss of the faith in the Scriptures which was maintained for so many centuries would render faith impossible in any new authority.

And the deep significance of these words was felt by us years ago when first we read them. In the Scriptures we have a cedar of spiritual authority which for eighteen centuries has been putting forth its roots in the life-soil of our human consciousness; and beneath its shadow the religious and moral life of humanity have increased inconceivably in worth and merit. Now hew this cedar down, and for a little while green leaves will still appear upon its downcast trunk; but who will give another cedar for the children of our people? who guar-

antee a shade like unto this? This is why we have bowed before these Scriptures with the unaffected simplicity of the little child, in simple faith, and not as a result of learning; for this we have zealously defended these Scriptures, and now rejoice in our soul as we render thanks unto God for seeing a new increase of faith in these Holy Scriptures. You know we are not conservative, but this is our conservatism: we seek to save the foliage of this cedar for our people, lest shortly they should be without a covering in a barren, scorching desert. As our Saviour believed in Moses and the prophets, so we desire to believe in the Scriptures. For he who in this matter of the Scriptures accuses Christ of error attacks thereby the mystery itself upon which is founded the whole Church of Christ, denying that he should be our Lord and also our God.

"Isolation is your strength." This is the golden motto Groen van Prinsteren bequeathed to the *issus de Calvin*. What we have said is plea for this significant device. And is anyone afraid lest, under this motto and by this system, poetry be sacrificed to pantheism and the unity of the cosmos to evolution? Then listen how from the tents of the saints throughout the earth there arises one voice, which gathers everything that lives, and breathes, and thinks, and does not think into an entirely different unity, namely, the unity of praise; as the ancient player on the harp sings of a God who "has established an order for his creatures which they cannot transgress," so that, with the sound of cymbals, all, all may sing in unison:

Praise Him, ye heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens;
Praise the Lord, ye earth, ye dragons and all deeps.
Praise him, ye mountains and all hills, ye beasts and all cattle,
Ye fruitful trees and all cedars, ye kings of the earth and all people,
Both young men and maidens, ye old men and children;
Let all praise the name of the Lord.
For he hath exalted the horn of his people,
The praise of all his saints, a people near unto him.



EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

OPINION.

ONE is sometimes on the verge of saying that the Bible has suffered less from its avowed enemies than at the hands of its professed and doubtless well-meaning friends. Interpretations have been put upon the word of God which have discredited it before the intelligence and moral sense of multitudes of the thoughtful and the earnest. Ministers lacking intelligence have fulminated indiscriminate denunciations of fiction, whose sermons were as truly works of imagination and as far from facts as any novel, and as unworthy of the pulpit as the haggadic legends of the Talmud would be of a place in the sacred canon. Men of fluent tongues, who did not take the trouble to be students of the Scriptures, have taught all manner of strange things from behind the open Bible, and have dressed up the inspired text in such grotesque embellishings, with no warrant save their uninstructed and reckless fancy, that, instead of being preachers of the word, they became nothing better than chartered libertines of the imagination, posturing and prancing in a sort of religious *mardi gras*. In a clerical circle it was remarked concerning a certain crowd-compelling minister, whose expositions of Bible history and doctrine were as wild as his antics, "Well, we must admit that he has obeyed the injunction to stir up the gift that is in him and make the most of it;" and, on the question being asked what the man's gift was, the reply came, "His imagination." It were better for a minister to confine himself to simply didactic and hortatory preaching, enforcing repentance, holiness, and the practical duties of life on the basis of the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, and the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, than to be conjuring with texts to see what novel notions he can suck out of them or pump into them, a course certain to result in farfetched, forced, and fantastic explanations and many petty puerilities of interpretation.

Perhaps no branch of Bible exposition has been more overstrained than typology, wherein the propensity to ride a hobby has frequently appeared. We recently encountered a volume whose eminent author had typology "on the brain." To a degree the human mind is apt to find what it seeks and to see what it looks for. The optimist who looks for reasons of gladness will, by mere force of his disposition, magnify and multiply the actual reasons. A lover will probably see excellences in his lady which are not really there. A fault-finder on the lookout for flaws in everything is likely to allege some things to be imperfections which are not so. The credulous victim of superstition, expecting ghosts, can see or hear them almost any dark night. A population believing in witches can find enough of them anywhere to keep the gallows and the stake well sup-

plied. The natural and sometimes dangerous proclivity of the medical specialist is to regard the pathologic condition in every case as originating in the particular physical tract covered by his specialty; whether it is there or not he sees what he is in the habit of looking for. Similarly, some Bible teachers, who might properly be called professional typologists, discern parallels, prophecies, and intentional adumbrations everywhere. The mind that sets out to hunt for types and shadows is sure to find strange similitudes containing startling significance. It only needs that two characters or events have some feature in common and one be antecedent to the other for certain expositors to discover subtle resemblances which perforce make the former a type and the latter a fulfillment of the type. In such hands Scripture narratives, which are sufficiently valuable as simple history and were never intended to be treated as anything else, become deep depositories of foreknowledge and preintimation.

This propensity to set forth all personalities and events of the Old Testament as prophetic types of later things has brought prophecy into contempt. A few men make too little of Bible prophecy; but they are less injurious than the larger multitude who have made too much of it, setting up claims for it which no facts substantiate. That typology has been heavily overworked is seen in such examples of it as the following: that Abraham is a type of Christ, because he obeyed the will of God; that his tent is a type of the Church; that Joseph in the pit is a type of the Church in the wilderness, and Joseph reigning in Egypt a type of the Church triumphant; that Joseph is, as well, a type of Christ, inasmuch as he saved his brethren; that Samson is a type of Christ, because he suffered himself to be bound with cords, and also because it was immediately after his marriage that Samson made the first display of his might against Philistia, just as it was at a marriage that the Son of Mary first manifested his miraculous power; that Samson slaying a lion was a prophetic type of Jesus encountering Satan; that even Sisera may be regarded as a type of Christ, and the mother of Sisera awaiting his return as typical of the Christian awaiting Christ's return! It is amazing to find in sermons, Sunday school magazines, and lesson leaves how many Old Testament worthies and unworthies were types of Christ—not only Moses and Joshua and David, but likewise all the judges, because they were saviors of their brethren; and how many even were types of John the Baptist, among whom, we are told, was Elijah, because, *as a dignitary* of the English Church has actually written, "as the persecution of Elijah by the king drove him, as it were, for refuge to the fiery chariot," so "the persecution of John by Herod ended his sufferings under the sword of the executioner and sent him to his rest." Who would believe, before the fact, that an Anglican bishop could be guilty of such astounding and outrageous exegesis? Is it in the power of the bitterest enemy of Christianity in all England to do as much toward bringing the Bible into contempt? This is typology gone mad through being overworked. Equally justifiable would it be to go type-hunting through ante-biblical ages to the time when the mountains were brought forth, and to point out how

obvious it is that the Mountain of the Holy Cross was set in the Rocky Mountains by the Creator as a prophecy of the crucifixion on Calvary. An American satirist was of opinion that William Shakespeare could not have been a successful Washington correspondent of a New York daily—he lacked the requisite imagination. In the presence of such biblical literature as we are considering one must doubt for the same reason if Shakespeare was qualified to be a typologist. In addition to the wonders of monomaniac typology much information which might be labeled, “Important if true,” is furnished us, such as that when Abraham received back Isaac from the altar he foresaw the mystery of Christ’s resurrection; that it was Satan who appeared in the person of the dead Samuel; that Melchizedek was no other than the patriarch Shem in disguise!

We are not implying that the Lord hath not more light and truth to break forth from his word. On the contrary, we are sure that the thorough, exact, and comprehensive student of the Bible will become a steward of the manifold mysteries of God, able to bring forth out of his storehouse things new as well as old. We believe in a long, progressive ascertainment of the mind of God, of the deep meanings of divine revelation, and of its universal applicability to human life. We are protesting only against treating the word of God as essentially cabalistic. We object to the sort of commentators and religious teachers who extract from or put into scripture passages meanings not to be discerned there by any ordinary Christian mind; and we like them no better when they justify their transcendental exegesis on the ground that these things are spiritually discerned and are visible only to themselves because of their superior spiritual-mindedness. Our objection and dislike are founded on the fact that many of the meanings they report seem to us at variance with the general tenor of Holy Scripture and foreign to the spirit of Christianity, which is a “spirit of power, and of love, and of a sound mind”—not of any one of these alone, but of all three together. We prefer scripture interpretations which bear evidence of having been obtained by minds in close contact with the record itself, rather than those which seem to have been constructed by some traveler far from home who had forgotten to take his Bible with him. If there be an animal—elephant, giraffe, or whatever else—which we cannot study with our own eyes we choose to take our description of it from the scientific books of natural history, and not to have it evolved for us by a German philosopher out of the depths of his inner consciousness. In like manner we prefer to have Scripture interpreted to us by direct and minute scientific examination of the plain, natural, obvious, original meaning of the text, and not by the pietistic lucubrations of any mystic, however devout, who offers as the teaching of revelation the suggestions, meandering reflections, and vagaries of his own mind. There is not so much to fear from critical scholarship, which makes some mistakes, as from ignorance, which never goes right in matters requiring intelligence except once in a thousand times by accident or “luck.” If a dear life were in peril we would sooner put the case into the hands of a competent medical man, many and fatal as the mistakes of physicians

have been, than into those of one who was not a graduate of any medical school. The style of interpretation with which we are finding fault does not stop with being absurd; it amounts often to a gross profanation of the divine book. To take such liberties with Holy Writ is to play such fantastic tricks before high heaven as might make the angels weep. Swedenborg, with amiable intentions, carried the imaginative method to its last possible pitch in his elaborate system of "correspondences" and "applications."

The Bible is not alone in having been subjected to such treatment. Certain men who deemed themselves scholars have applied this style of exposition to the great pyramid, and also to the zodiac and its twelve signs, with the most fearful and wonderful results in the amount and quality of the information obtained, derived apparently from no known records, but magically produced from secret fountains of knowledge hidden in the intricate recesses of their own mysteriously wise and inventive minds. When men holding the position of public teachers publish such stuff we are reminded of the man who was told he would better not know so much than to know so many things that were not so; and we say, if this be scholarship let us rather sit at the feet of some plain man endowed with common sense, sufficiently sane to distinguish between his fancies and reality, and honest enough not to pretend to knowledge where he has no facts. We venture to suggest the question whether even such a book as Guthrie's *The Gospel in Ezekiel*, noble as it is in many ways, evinces in all its parts a wise and warrantable use of the Old Testament. Some have set out to find the Gospel in the stars, and have succeeded in reading into them a good deal that neither astronomers nor inspired sages ever saw there. The myths and legends of ancient mythology are just as susceptible of this sort of treatment in the hands of genius, and have in fact been expounded in recent years on the imaginative plan by men who almost make it appear that in those old mythologies lay hid such treasures of wisdom, earthly and heavenly, that the mission of Christianity would seem superfluous, no further revelation being necessary than those blessed Greeks and fortunate Romans possessed, locked up in their fine Olympian schemes of gods and goddesses. Reading these expositions, we are moved to wonder why the only competent exegetes of these secret gospels should have come along several thousand years too late to be of any help to the nations and generations who invented and believed in all that mythologic lore.

Our much-abused Bible has been made responsible for many things it does not teach; as, for example, when it was represented as fixing the creation of the world six thousand years back, whereas it named no date, but only said, "*In the beginning* God created the heaven and the earth." The inspired truth has also suffered by processes resembling the following: first, a narrow misconception, formed upon some fragment of revelation; then, a searching of the Scriptures for confirmation of that conception and a tearing loose from their connection of passages to be used as proof-texts; then, the erection of the misconception so supported into a dogma.

finally and most lamentably, the making of that dogma, incorrect as it is, and inessential as it would be even if correct, a standard of faith and a test of orthodoxy. So much of this unwisdom has been perpetrated in the past that we do not wonder when, in any religious body, wise men protest upon occasion against the creation of new standards and the further multiplication of tests of orthodoxy.

THE business world is always swinging between excessive confidence and unreasonable distrust, reaching either extreme periodically. Unreasonable distrust has prevailed during this year, and many failures are the inevitable consequence. The causes of distrust have existed, but have been exaggerated in the imaginative temper of our people. One of these causes is that "the people have ordered" a great economic change from protection to free trade. Sensible persons do not expect this change to be made suddenly, if it is really to be made at all; but it is still a check to manufacturing enterprises, and has tended to arrest the expansion of production which had been going on for a decade. That this expansion was itself dangerous may be believed without affecting the fact that the check is one of the conditions of the prevailing distrust.

A more seriously dangerous condition of distrust is the silver legislation of recent years in the face of the fall in the bullion value of that metal. The causes of this fall are two—decreased use of silver as money by the great commercial nations, and increased production of silver, especially in this country. Practical men know that anything must have less value when more of it is produced and at the same time its use is decreased. This touches business at the very heart, because our silver laws have compelled us to ask, How many cents are there in a dollar? The great body of our people never asks this question. It did not ask it in 1864, when a dollar had barely fifty cents in it. But men who borrow and lend money had to ask it in 1864, and have to ask it in 1893. The borrower is least apt to ask it, and therefore the question did not create distrust in 1864 to any such extent as in 1893. For now it is the lender who asks it, and he has the power to secure himself against the danger of getting back fifty dollars for every one hundred he lends. He has been protecting himself by taking gold obligations for several years. But he has come to the point of doubting the effectiveness of this kind of obligation. Indeed, we have reached a point where a loan for ninety days is made with a doubt whether the one dollar will be repaid at the rate of one hundred cents or fifty cents. The gold dollar which has since 1879 been the measure of value may be supplanted by a silver dollar of half its value.

Is it possible that we shall exchange the gold bushel for the silver half bushel? Sane and prudent men hope to keep the existing standard, but they know it must be fought for against a force not to be despised in a republic. That force is the financial ignorance of the majority of the American people as represented in the proclaimed opinions of the fifty-third Congress. Senator Sherman is reported to have said that he knew

in 1890 that the voting majority of the people desired free coinage of silver—that is to say, the silver standard. The Congress elected in 1892 must change its mind and betray pledges to its constituents or adopt the silver standard. It will probably change its mind. The object lesson given in the effects of uncertainty during this summer will, it is hoped, deter Congress from carrying out the will of the majority of the people. But that will remains unchanged because the ignorance upon which it rests remains. Now and then a man gets enlightened respecting the half-bushel question in finance, but the voting majority remains uninstructed.

Expert business men know—the knowledge has been forced upon them—the feeling of the voters, and they may well doubt whether any influences can induce many congressmen to “betray their constituents” in order to save those constituents from ruin. Much of the popular confusion comes of the American tendency to theorize and from the unhappy financial history of the country from 1861 to 1879. Since the latter date there has been a greenback, a fiat dollar, and a silver “craze.” But this newspaper word hardly grasps the full fact. Through all this movement—for under several names it is one—the theorizing habits and the ignorance over which it exercises a fatal despotism have prevailed chiefly because the first principles of the science of money are taught in few newspapers and fewer political speeches. The matter is further complicated in the popular mind by the so-called bimetallic theory, that silver and gold can both be standards at the same place and time. Each is a product of labor, and, like coal, each is worth in the market more or less, according to the supply of it and the use of it. Experience proves that it is difficult to fix the relative values of the two on a stable basis. We fix the relation this year, and next year the market value of the two has changed so that one is worth in coin more than the other. Our legislation has disguised this fact, because the government pays a gold dollar for a silver dollar after coinage, though, before coining, it buys the silver one for fifty or sixty cents.

The conditions of distrust have taken effect as though they were real causes. Business is done very largely on a credit system. Manufacturers and traders borrow a large portion of their capital. Distrustful holders of money have declined to lend in the face of uncertainty. Banks have called in loans, declined to make new loans, and held fast their money. Depositors have become alarmed and made “runs” on suspected banks. Traders and producers have found it impossible to borrow to the same extent as last year and have closed their doors. A diminished sale of goods has begun to add to the trouble and to stop mills lacking orders. It is a road we have been over before in this country more than once, and it is rough and dangerous. The limits of reasonable distrust have been passed; but it is not too late for Congress and the common sense of the sensible people to arrest our progress toward general bankruptcy. The visionary theorist is silenced by the cries of distress. The ignorant voter is not quite so sure that he knows more than the economists of the world.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

 "IS CHRISTIANITY PROGRESSING?" IS JUDAISM PROGRESSING?

WHETHER Christianity be progressing is the inquiry of liberal Judaism, through one of its cultured representatives, in *The Menorah Monthly* of June, 1893. The question is of sufficient candor and importance to merit careful consideration. Voluntarily or involuntarily all classes, creeds, and conditions of men recognize the supremacy of our Lord Jesus Christ, that "all power is given unto" him "in heaven and in earth," that the Father has "given all things into his hands," and that he "hath committed all judgment unto the Son." The Mediator reigns. His decisions are of sovereign authority. To him all nations must bow.

"Is Christianity progressing?" Absolutely and relatively it is. Numerically it bears larger proportion to the mass of humanity than in any previous era, both in nominally Christian and non-Christian lands. But, while this is conceded, the question is urged whether Christianity, as an organized, incorporated religion, is progressing "in the direction of the higher conception of the religious ideal, the nearer approach to the higher purposes of life, the elevation of the human race?" Is it in these particulars justifying its claims to superiority over all other religious systems, its evangelistic activities, and its demands upon universal faith and obedience? "Has it established its superiority to the mother, the Jewish religion, from the loins of which it sprang?" It does not help the answer, in the estimation of modern Jewish writers, to refer to New Testament teachings, and, "to the elevated ethical character of the Sermon on the Mount, because the sublime moral truths enunciated there were taught, previous to the advent of Jesus, by the sacred books of the Jews, as well as by the teachers of Israel." This is true in part. The two great commandments, on which hang all the law and the prophets, were issued and taught for many centuries "before the birth of the Founder of Christianity;" but he imparted to them a fullness and richness of meaning of which neither patriarch nor prophet had any just conception. Hillel's golden saying, "What is hateful to yourself do not unto others," is of negative character. Christ embodied it in the far more comprehensive and positive injunction, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." Hillel guards life against injury; Christ not only protects, but floods it with blessing. Graetz,* whose opinions express the ideas and feelings of liberal Judaism, classes Jesus of Nazareth with Hillel the Babylonian and Philo the Alexandrian as one of the great moralists of the first century. The latter, he says, was superior "in beauty of style and in depth of thought, whilst he was animated with equally fervent convictions"—

* *History of the Jews*, vol. ii, p. 214. Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1893.

a conclusion with which it is impossible for the profoundly critical Christian student to agree.

"Israel's mission is peace"—peace to be wrought out through moral tuition of the nations. But "Judaism," Graetz declares, "could gain admission into the hearts of the heathens only by taking another name and assuming new forms, for with its old designation and distinctive features it was not popular." This admission is worthy of italics and should never be absent from memory. It confesses the weakness of Judaism and its unfitness to become the world-religion. Jesus of Nazareth, although not proficient in the legal knowledge taught by the contemporary schools of Hillel and Shammai, was the efficient agent in winning acceptance for all that is divine in Judaism from the Gentiles. "High-minded earnestness and spotless moral purity were his undeniable attributes. . . . His whole being was permeated by that deeper religiousness which consecrates to God not only the hour of prayer, a day of penitence, and longer or shorter periods of devotional exercise, but every step in the journey of life; which turns every aspiration of the soul toward him, subjects everything to his will, and with childlike trust commits everything to his keeping. He was filled with tender brotherly love," and "doubtless possessed warm sympathies and a winning manner, which caused his words to produce a deep and lasting effect." "He, by word and example, raised the sinner and the publican and filled the hearts of those poor, neglected, thoughtless beings with the love of God, transforming them into dutiful children of their heavenly Father. He animated them with his own piety and fervor, and improved their conduct by the hope he gave them of being able to enter into the kingdom of heaven. That was the greatest miracle that Jesus performed. . . . He had many faithful disciples, both men and women, who followed him everywhere and obeyed him in all things. They renounced their former immoral and irreligious life. . . . The devout took offense at his going about eating and drinking with sinners, publicans, and women of a degraded class,"* even when it was manifest to all that the object of association was attained by the influence of his spirit and teaching in the uplifting and purification of his companions.

All these statements constitute deserved Jewish tribute to the character of our Lord, but are not commensurate with the unique grandeur of his nature and achievements. This is most apparent in the light of his own sayings: "That the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you." "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one toward another." Only as love, implicitly observant of the Master's mandates and burning with judicious enthusiasm for the good of humanity, and especially of those who are partakers of "a like pre-

* Graetz's *History of the Jews*, vol. ii, p. 154.

cious faith," distinguishes the professed disciples of Christ do they demonstrate the soundness of their claim to Christianity. In Jesus Christ the divine ideal of manhood was manifest in the flesh. De Quincey remarked that all our thoughts have not words corresponding to them. They lie in our imperfect natures like the silent melodies in a great musician's heart, never to roll forth on harp or organ. But Jesus Christ is the Word of God, he in whom the Father's thought has found full and perfect utterance. Just as men enter into possession of his loving, considerate spirit, into his habit of self-sacrifice and helpfulness, into his catholicity of charity, into his faith in the religious and moral possibilities of the race, do they advance in civilization and social welfare.

"Christianity," it is conceded by liberal Judaism, "has accomplished a high mission" in leading humanity to faith in the cardinal article of the Israelitish creed—"The Lord our God is one, and his name one"—and to "the Father in heaven, as the fountain of love, mercy, and life, bodily and spiritual." It has accomplished far more than that. It has revealed the wonder, the impartiality, the riches of his love to all mankind—not to the Jew only, but also to the Gentile—and in so doing has presented in most vivid and forceful fashion the two great facts of God's fatherhood and man's brotherhood. Simultaneously it proclaims and enforces a mutual love among men that cannot but be the solvent of all social problems and the best preparative for celestial bliss. Judaism is to Christianity what the beloved and well-trained boy is to the perfect man. Its seers beheld, its prophets predicted, its sibyls sang the glorious blessings of Messiah's kingdom. Philo and the scholarly thinkers of Alexandria strove to express revealed truths in terms of Greek and other philosophies. History, science, philosophy, poetry, literature, and art ceaselessly present Christianity in sweeter, stronger, sunnier lights.

Christianity is not identical with its avowed exponents any more than the soul is identical with the body, although the body may indicate more or less clearly the qualities of the spirit. Christianity is not churchianity, as scriptural Judaism is not one with modern rabbinism. They have much in common, but are not the same. Christianity's norm is exhibited with more or less of error, imperfection, and foreign admixture by all its differing sects, even when they are actuated by fervent zeal to exemplify their highest conceptions of it. Like comment on Judaism is not less just and timely. "Is Christianity progressing?" Is Judaism progressing? Both questions postulate the truth that neither is practically perfect, that both ought to be perfect, and that the goal of strenuous effort is perfection, wholeness of nature, and complete adaptedness to environment.

Christianity must not be confounded with Greek Catholicism. The mediæval paganism, inhumanity, atrocious cruelty, and unspeakable tyranny of the Russian autocrat and his lay inquisitor Pobiedonostseff toward dissentient Christians and determined Jews have nothing in common with the religion of Christ. In no country is the caricature of true Christianity more disgraceful than in Russia. Yet even there the theory of the Orthodox Russian Church, according to Pierre Botkine, secretary

of the Russian legation at Washington, is that "the amplest freedom of faith and practice" should be everywhere allowed, and that the saying of our Lord, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," should receive the fullest practical deference. Theory is belied by practice; but the spirit voiced in the theory is permanent in portions of the Russian people and will in the future be ascendant in governmental administration. Tolstoi is only one of several prophets. Revolution will be the remedy for unnumbered wrongs.

Christianity certainly does not exhibit its noblest embodiments in the population and churches of France. Yet the country itself is a paradise for the Jews, and that because the impartial spirit of its creed survived the *dragonnades* of Louis XIV and the emigration of the Huguenots. The seeds of divine truth sown by the latter and harrowed into the heart of the commonalty by the infamous Inquisition possessed vitality enough to spring up into a harvest of equal rights for all classes—rights since then repeatedly lost and regained, because the people had not sufficient Christian light to guide political action. As it now is they are not blind to the malignity of antisemitic agitation. Christianity, in the person of M. Anatole Leroy Beaulieu, avows its belief that "intolerance is repugnant to Christianity." "Nothing appears" to that gentleman "to be more repugnant to the Gospel than the hatred of races." Judæophobia is wholly irreconcilable with its genius and aim.

The *Judenhetze* of Germany is without excuse from the teachings of Christ and his apostles. It is largely of the earthly, sensual, and devilish type, and is in discord with genuine Lutheran catholicity. Notwithstanding the retrogressive effect of antisemitism on German civilization and the declaration of Professor Mommsen that it is chiefly of the *canaille*, it is demonstrable that it emanates mainly from the ruling classes, who attempt to utilize it as a political instrument for manipulating the masses and for warding off invasion of their own privileges. Notwithstanding and because of its virulence, powerful preachers and writers diligently and doughtily employ voice and pen in defense of universal brotherhood. Nor do they forget that the Israelidæ are the "descendants of those who gave to the world the Gospel of Christ." "*Der Jude wird verbrannt*" is no motto of real Christianity. Only three members of the new Reichstag represent unreasoning antipathy to the Jews. Ahlwardt, now serving a three months' incarceration for libeling Von Loewe, the Hebrew gunmaker, and the German officials, is shorn of power for much mischief, and Stoecker seems to be discredited. Dr. K. Kohler is eloquent in eulogy of Nahida Remy, the Christian German woman who, with clear brain, trenchant pen, and "deep, sympathetic, tender heart," feels doubly stimulated to undo the wrong inflicted by her countrymen upon the Jews.

In the United States the contagion of antisemitic feeling has taken the form of social proscription rather than that of religious intolerance. Hotels and boarding houses have been closed against Jews as Jews. Business discriminations and refusal of election to membership in clubs have been

justified on the same ground. If objection rest on offensive personal peculiarities it leaves no room for just complaint; but if it be to Jews as Jews it is an unwarrantable insult to the most ancient, gifted, and influential division of Adam's descendants. As such the Christian American is ashamed of it, and the press, sacred and secular, denounces it. "The preachers, too, in the past and present, have been outspoken in their condemnation of acts of intolerance and race prejudice."* "But the Churches as organized bodies," it is complained, "have preserved an ominous silence" on this question. There is somewhat of truth in this. "What has the Church done as an organized body," it is asked, "to counteract the spread of sentiment opposed to the very first principle professed by Christianity—that of the brotherhood of man? And in face of such culpable negligence can the Church still claim to have progressed and to be entitled to the recognition of living up to the divine command, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself?'"

In reply to these questions quotation of what the querist has just said of American preachers is decidedly apposite. So is his statement in *The Menorah Monthly*, page 71, of August, 1892, that leading men of all the German Churches denounce antisemitism, and that "societies for the suppression of antisemitism have been established at Berlin and Vienna, composed of the most representative men in the best and highest circles." So are his citations of Christian testimony to the tenacity of the Jewish racial character, its power of resistance to degrading forces, its family attachments and domestic virtues, its economy and sobriety, its thirst for knowledge, and its large-hearted charity. As an "organized body" the Church of Christ has not protested against Russian intolerance, for as a formally organized body it has no visible existence. But it has protested and does protest, and that forcibly, through many of its members. Joseph Jacobs† speaks of the "remonstrant appeals" and "the indignant protests of her [Russia's] Christian neighbors," and also of that deeply interested and protesting meeting at the Mansion House in London which "drew the attention of all Europe to the criminal apathy of the Russian government." What the Christian Church has done for its suffering co-religionists in Russia it has also done, and has done even more, for the outraged and despoiled Jews, and therefore has, to that extent, fulfilled the divine command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." Wherever Christianity is best appreciated there the Jews receive fairest treatment. It is true that the Church has not finished her work at home, nor will she do so while humanity remains the sad admixture of good and evil that it now is. Much more has it not, as yet, succeeded in fully realizing the predictions of evangelical Isaiah and filled the world with peace, equity, and love. But it is doing much of what it is empowered to do, and is faithfully endeavoring to persuade the Jews, whom it regards as brethren, to walk with Christians in the fellowship of the Father and of his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.

To this invitation the Jews object, and professedly for the reason that

* *The Menorah Monthly*, June, 1893.

† *The Century*, July, 1893.

the Church has not accomplished its ostensible mission and, therefore, is not preferable to Judaism. Christianity, it must be conceded with sorrow, has not realized the consummation of its aims; but it has effected vastly more for the good of the world than Judaism has done, glorious as the record of the latter is. Lecky sets forth historic facts when he says:

The high conception which has been formed of the sanctity of human life, the protection of infancy, the elevation and final emancipation of the slave classes, the suppression of barbarous games, the creation of a vast and multifarious organization of charity, and the education of the imagination by the Christian type, constitute together a movement of philanthropy which has never been paralleled or approached in the pagan (or Hebrew) world. The effects of this movement in promoting happiness have been very great. Its effect in determining character has probably been still greater. In that proportion or disposition of qualities which constitutes the ideal character the gentler and more benevolent virtues have obtained, through Christianity, the foremost place.*

Professor Bowne says:

Our conceptions of God, life, and death have been greatly clarified by Christianity. Thereby a vast extension has been given to moral principles, and the sense of obligation has been reinforced. It also affirms an origin and destiny for man which give him an inalienable sacredness. By its edict of comprehension it makes all men children of a common Father and heirs of eternal life. . . . Christianity also sets up a transcendent personal ideal which is at once the master light of all our moral seeing and our chief spiritual inspiration. Thereby the thoughts of many hearts have, indeed, been revealed; for men never know so well what spirit they are of as when contemplating it. . . . Rights grow more sacred, duties enlarge, and the sense of obligation deepens. Love and loyalty to a person take the place of reverence for an abstract law. The law, indeed, is unchanged, but by being lifted up into an expression of a holy will it becomes vastly more effective.†

While candidly confessing the delinquencies of visible Christianity we are amply sustained by the evidence in asserting that it is progressing, and that with unprecedented rapidity, toward a realization of the highest conceivable religious ideal, a closer approach to life's noblest ends, and the sure elevation of the human race. It is only fair and courteous that we should ask, "Is Judaism progressing in the same direction?" Numerically its exponents and advocates increase. The chastity, sobriety, industry, frugality, dietary and sanitary laws, and religion of the Israelites all conduce to multiplication. But are they progressing in religious, ethical, and moral respects? Here also the answer must be affirmative. Readers of Jewish religious literature will not doubt that piety, godliness, and philanthropy receive strikingly beautiful illustrations among them. Spectators of synagogic and family worship see plainly that earnestness and high moral purpose characterize many in their devotions. Sermons and lectures in the temples are of high order, and instruction of youth is thorough and influential. In respect of churchly activity and communal liberality the Hebrews are worthy of warm praise. New York may serve as a sample of all American cities. In it are thirty-six places of worship known as synagogues or temples. These, as a rule, have crowded attend-

* *History of European Morals*, vol. i, pp. 100, 101.

† *The Principles of Ethics*.

ance. There is also a very large number of minor congregations worshipping in halls in the lower part of the city. Sabbath (Saturday) morning services are held in six public hospitals, asylums, and free schools, and in the Jewish Theological Seminary. Sunday lectures are delivered from November to May, at eleven o'clock A. M., in the Temple Emanu-El. Thirty-two communal organizations are munificently maintained. Among them are hospitals, asylums, trade schools, immigrants' homes, free schools, working girls' clubs, nurseries, lying-in relief societies, training schools for nurses, immigrant aid societies, poor relief, ministerial, and cantors' associations. Eighteen sisterhoods for personal service, seven benefit societies, and two admirably appointed free libraries are always abounding in good words and works. The New York branch of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* cooperates with co-religionists everywhere in the preservation of Jewish racial and religious autonomy. Faith is shown by works, and these, with few exceptions, are as much in harmony with the ancient conception of the great law of love as are those of Christians with that conception of it so marvelously illustrated by their Lord and Saviour. In mechanical, mercantile, and professional pursuits the degree of honesty and efficiency falls little below that of a similar number of Gentiles. Some people affirm that it stands on an equally high plane. If it should fall far below that of surrounding non-Hebrew compatriots it is only what might be reasonably expected in view of their former experiences in the lands whence the majority came, Great Britain and France excepted. The simple fact is that the Jews are human beings and, as human beings, present blendings of good and evil similar to those apparent in people of other races. Good and evil in manifestation are modified by heredity, environment, and education. The good provokes enmity in the envious, and the evil intensifies the animosity with which strangers to their blood, religious usages, and social customs regard them.

Is there no occasion for the prejudice and repulsion of which all Israelites complain? That there are Jews and Jewesses in large numbers of rarely excellent culture, sound moral principles, pure religious nature, generous and delicate philanthropy, courtly and gracious manners, goes without saying to Christians who enjoy their acquaintance. That there are also Jews of both sexes who are offensive in manners and morals, loud, self-asserting, and obtrusive, greedy, overreaching, and overbearing, unprincipled, immoral, and vicious, is confessed with grief and shame by those of the better classes. Thus, at the dinner given by the Maccabean Club, in London, on the 11th of June, 1893, to Lieutenant Colonel Goldsmid, agent of Baron Hirsch in his Argentine colonizing enterprise, the guest of the occasion is reported as saying: "But first I must say that in Buenos Ayres there are Jews who are a disgrace to Judaism, and when I think of them I am an antisemite of the most bigoted description."* In many other cities there are nominal Jews of the same category. That the former class is held responsible for the sins of the latter is no less an injustice than it is a certainty. All that the true

* *The American Hebrew*, p. 276. New York, June 30, 1893.

Israelite asks is that he be allowed to stand on his own merits, and that he be not iniquitously chastised for the faults and foibles of others, simply because they are of the same religious communion.

What of objectionable nature there is in certain Jews of the United States is alleged by citizens of European nations to be still more evident and offensive in Semites in other lands. Thus, in 1879, Professor Heinrich von Treitschke, the historian, pointed out in the *Preussische Jahrbuch* "the growing power of the Jews, their solidarity as a separate caste of foreign race in Germany, their arrogance in the press, their resentment at the slightest reference to themselves as *lèse majesté*, while daily indulging in unstinted criticism of everything and everybody." Throughout Germany thousands of books and pamphlets accuse the Hebrews of every imaginable crime. It was a South German Romanist, Dr. Sigl, who exclaimed, "Never mind, the Jews shall be burned." His party clamor for the admission of the Jesuits to harry the Liberals and to persecute the Jews. In Roumania the Jews, four hundred thousand in number, are accused of enthralling the five million subjects of the monarchy. In Austria hatred and vilification of the Jew are limited only by inability to give them public expression. Even in France "Jew-hatred is spreading by leaps and bounds." The conspicuity in that country of German Jews among the many persons implicated in the disastrous Panama collapse is doubtless one cause of this phenomenon. Italy is affected by Judæophobia. Great Britain and the United States query how the immigration of the outcast Russian Jews may be stopped. Russia is determined to oust her Hebrew population, at the cost of sacrificing every Christian principle and of the deeper degradation and more revolting barbarism that necessarily ensue from bigotry, greed, and outrage. All this is unequivocally condemned by Christian canons.

Is there any palliation for these enormities, any excuse or shadow of excuse for these wrongs? Antisemitism adduces what it claims to be justifying reasons for its procedures. Among these is the allegation that the Jews furnish by far the largest quota in proportion to their numbers of the exploiters of modern civilization; that is to say, of the men who study and toil to gain all the wealth and other worldly advantage they may out of finance, commerce, and journalism, out of politics, literature, science, and art, without regard to the rights and interests of contemporaries. The Jew, it is said, stands apart as a spectator of men's weaknesses, intent only on profit. Reuter, Wolff, and others who are Jews own and control the great international telegraphic news companies. Their co-religionists rule the money and produce markets. Neither are they, as a rule, creators of wealth. In purveying for popular amusements they are among the most successful leaders. They supply capital, *impresarios*, critics, and wealthy audiences. None know better what will "take" with the public. For offices, social triumphs, titles, and decorations their capacity is equal to, if it does not surpass, that of the Celtic Irish. Their lawyers crowd the courts and their judges the bench. Among intellectual combatants they are in the front ranks. None enjoy

the pleasures of sensuous life more immoderately or fully than they. Multitudes swarm in first-class ocean steamships, in the best hotels at summer watering places, and in the most fashionable streets of cities. Of Freemasonry, it is charged, they make unscrupulous use. In all business affairs and in all literary, dramatic, and musical matters they have the coherence of an iron ring.

Simultaneously with these accusations comes the admission that they are sagacious and safe advisers in monetary investments and commercial transactions, and that to their projective foresight very much of social prosperity is due. It is also confessed that in many of the shadiest transactions of public men in haste to be rich, transactions in which some of the highest and purest Aryans have been criminally prominent, hardly a single Jew has been inculpated. Even the meanness of malice is constrained to applaud the sublime disinterestedness of public-spirited benefactors like Sir Moses Montefiore and Judah Touro and of leaders like Emin Pasha in Africa, who aspire to the gratification of the grandest passions of ideal human nature, without regard to wealth, or fame, or sect. In central and eastern Europe the Jew is a trusted providence—prescient, frugal, ambitious, energetic, successful. Exceptional fitness for conflict in the battles of modern life is the secret of his success. Yankees, Yorkshiremen, and canny Aberdeen Scots possess the same secret in equal extent. The fierce light that beats upon Hebrew racial and religious isolation brings into bold relief all that is most obnoxious to the inefficient, intolerant, and unsuccessful, and exposes the Jew to their hatred. He naturally feels his superiority, indulges his instinct for dominion, and is not always considerate in demeanor toward inferiors of his own or other races. Professor von Treitschke construes the exultant exclamation of Professor H. Graetz, the Jewish historian and spokesman, that “the Jews are recognized; it only remains for the spirit of Judaism to be recognized as well,” as meaning that Judaism must be recognized as a separate community within the nation, and laconically replies, “Never.” If by recognition Professor Graetz means only that which is accorded to each of the one hundred and forty-six religious sects in the American republic there can be no objection, and especially if, as Mr. Ellinger insists, the persistent aim of Judaism be “to make man virtuous, pure in thought and action, loving and lovable, abnegating and altruistic, more spiritual and intellectual—at all times and under all systems.” For “the essence of Judaism, consisting in the cognition of God and the duties flowing therefrom,” Christianity has only abiding friendship. It is to that false conception of Judaism and, equally, to that false conception of Christianity, which identify either or both with man-made rites and policies, with superstitions and immoralities, with rancor and cruelty, that it opposes invincible dislike. Recognition of Judaism as an *imperium in imperio* would be intolerable to the spirit and culture of the times. Any desire for such abnormality is what American Hebrews emphatically disclaim. Their right to religious opinion, worship, and customs peculiar to themselves will never be disputed so long as the practical enjoyment of them does not collide with the funda-

mental principles of modern civilization. Neither will any fair-minded American regret their success in chosen walks of life so long as that success is achieved in truth, fairness, and equity. Conservatives object to the socialistic doctrines of Marx, Lasalle, and Singer, but make a sad mistake in the use of persecution rather than of sound argument in reply. The gospel of "getting-on" at any price, with the concomitants of "arrogance, ostentation, vulgarity, heartlessness, and neglect of every moral principle," is the product of human, and not exclusively of Hebrew, depravity. Many Jews and Gentiles walk in its lurid, misleading glare to inevitable destruction, the Jews being, perhaps, more conspicuous in proportion to numbers because of their special race endowments. The real source of evil in nineteenth century society is "want of sense and want of grace; in one word, Philistinism and Pharisaism of every kind." Between "the ideal standard of precept and the mean average of practice the distance is enormous." Neither Jew nor Christian is without cause of complaint. Both forget the brotherhood of man, the fatherhood of God, and their responsibility to an infallible divine Judge for all the deeds done in the body.

Yet despite all complaints it is plain, when we contrast the present with the past, that Christianity and Judaism, so far as they represent the divine in the Old and New Testaments, are progressing. But they are still far from perfect embodiments of ideal standards. What then shall be done by both under the circumstances? Let discussion be free, fearless, truthful, charitable. Let neither Jew nor Christian be afraid of "conversionism." If either be in possession of the highest system of truth, natural or revealed, it is sure to prevail. Let Christianity labor to embody its highest ideal—that exemplified by Jesus of Nazareth—in the individual and collective life. Let Judaism be no less solicitous and strenuous in embodying its "highest conception of the religious ideal." Let it not shrink from, but welcome, the fresh light that may break forth from God's written word upon its mind and heart. Let all parties abstain from using the diabolical weapons of malice and calumny. Together let them work for the "improvement of humanity" and consult how best to raise the morals of society, to redeem the corrupted and perishing, to relieve suffering, and to establish the kingdom of God upon earth. No true Christian can doubt the result of enlightened conference and kindly cooperation. In mutual provocation to love and good works each will bear the fruits of all that is of God in its religious system. Gladly will Christianity accept the proposal of modern Judaism as represented by Mr. M. Ellinger: "If, after years of unselfish labor, they have succeeded in removing sin and have made men better and life sweeter, then let them compare notes, and the Church that can show the highest and best results achieved may then ask the other to come over to her as having presented the highest and best credentials of being . . . the best beloved" of God.* "And so all Israel shall be saved" through and in our Lord Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed for evermore.

* *The Menorah Monthly*, p. 349. New York, June, 1893.

VERSIONS *VERSUS* VERNACULARS.

BISHOP VINCENT has well said, in a recent number of this *Review*, that "students—consecrated, persistent students, and only such—are needed in the Methodism of the twentieth century. . . . And that pulpit must fail to command public respect and attention which does not present in a thoughtful, wise, and forcible way the great and glorious teachings of our holy religion." This being undoubtedly so, we feel impressed to add a word in reference to a branch of ministerial study which not young preachers only, but also many of longer experience, are very prone to neglect, greatly to the detriment of their usefulness. We mean the study of the languages in which the Bible was written, and more particularly the study of the Greek, since it is the New Testament rather than the Old which must ever stand as the fountain head of authority for the Christian faith.

Many have emphasized the fact that the original records of our religion, unlike those of some other systems, are of such a nature as to readily lend themselves to the process of translation, so that in the various tongues of the earth all the essentials of salvation can be distinctly, forcibly, and attractively set forth. This is both true and very important. But it is also true and equally important that the Bible, like all other ancient books in their original forms, contains a great deal that cannot be translated. What could probably be said of any two languages can certainly be said of Greek and English, that no single word in one has a precise counterpart in the other. Neither terms nor idioms, neither habits of thought nor modes of expression in any two nations exactly correspond. Each Greek word has a history of its own, carries with it certain associations and suggestions amounting to an atmosphere, which must be somewhat different, and oftentimes are widely different, from that of the English word which, on the whole, comes nearest to it in point of significance and so would rightly and necessarily be made to represent it. It may be said that no two English words are absolutely synonymous. Much less would it be possible to find identity of meaning in any two words which had been separated all their lifetime by continents and seas.

We are obliged, then, to say that, while for the ordinary reader who seeks only to know the plain principles of religion any good translation of the New Testament is wholly sufficient, a careful study of the original, which may be truly called the real New Testament, is absolutely essential for the scholar, for the teacher, for the preacher, for him who wishes to penetrate deeply into the mind of the Spirit. That is the real New Testament which the writers of it themselves wrote, not that resemblance to it which, having passed through other minds, has suffered the inevitable modifications that such passage necessarily entails. Words, at the best, are very imperfect vehicles of thought; and when that thought has to struggle through a medium yet more complex, has to go from hand to hand, from mouth to mouth, its chance of becoming fully understood is

poor indeed. We must lessen as much as possible the likelihood of contamination by getting as close as we can to the source.

The thousand subtle distinctions and delicate shades of meaning involved in the topics of which the sacred writers treat are difficult to grasp under any circumstances. How slight, then, the probability of grasping them if they are approached only through the clumsy contrivance which we call a translation! The precise idea will certainly be missed in a vast number of cases by him who stops short of the very expressions which fell from the lips or the pen of the authors. All know how great is the difference between hearing a magnetic speaker and reading in cold print what he said. It is not simply what he said, but the way he said it, that makes the impression. The tones of the voice and the play of the features, the inflections, the gestures, the whole attitude and expression of the living orator as with soul on fire he throws himself into his audience—these things cannot be put in type. Closely similar is the difference between reading the New Testament in the original and reading it in a translation. In the Greek each sentence throbs with life; it speaks, it enters not simply into the ear, but into the heart. We seem to be in the very presence of Paul himself, of Peter, John, and James. St. Augustine's three wishes were, "To see Christ in the flesh, to hear Paul preach, to see Rome in its glory." The second of these is practically fulfilled to him who masters the Greek, and even the first is largely realized. Such is the vividness imparted to the words that we not only hear Paul preaching, we almost behold the Lord himself teaching and healing. Both the gospels and the epistles take on a freshness most inspiring. If it be, as Renan claims, that the Holy Land is a fifth gospel, then may we also say that to possess and peruse the Greek original of the New Testament is to find twenty-seven more books—is to have a doubled Testament.

Surely if this be so, if there are big nuggets of precious gold waiting for those who ply their picks with vigor in the mine of untranslated truth, if there are hidden gems of thought in abundance only needing to be diligently sought by means of lexicon and grammar, no preacher, without very weighty reasons, ought to excuse himself from the duty or deny himself the privilege of such search. No preacher who does thus excuse himself can feel as sure of his footing as he ought in any argument that turns on the exact statement of Scripture; for whole trains of reasoning frequently depend on the force of a tense or the nature of a participle. Nor can such a preacher exhibit in his pulpit treatment of sacred themes that originality of view and that calm consciousness of authority which come so readily from close contact with the very words of inspiration. His devotional hours will also miss many sweet morsels of nourishing food well fitted to strengthen his soul.

It is true that the Revised Version, so vastly superior to King James's in faithfulness of rendering, puts the English reader now in a position greatly improved from that which he occupied before. But a polished and elaborate version, which must endeavor to be a model of idiomatic English for the daily use of the common people, which can never indulge

In paraphrase, which is fixed upon, perhaps, as a compromise between strongly differing minds, which is under the necessity of conforming to previous versions, and whose creation is hedged about by a variety of other hampering conditions, is necessarily very different from the closely literal, vigorously phrased rendering which the habitual reader of the Greek Testament has full liberty to make for himself. It is also true that the commentaries give a great deal of the result of critical study. Yet they differ widely among themselves; they are often largely influenced by peculiar doctrinal prepossessions; and we frequently have to go through much that is questionable or extremely commonplace to sift out a little that is really valuable. It is better to go to the well and draw directly for one's self, even with rude appliances, than to depend on these beautiful but unsatisfying buckets belonging to others. No commentator does more than make a selection from the multitude of thoughts that come to him in his patient investigation of the inexhaustible word. He is quite likely to leave out the things which another would find the most profitable of all. Far preferable is it to make one's own selection.

He who reads, and reads continuously and largely, the sacred text till he is fully steeped in it will find the gospel truth standing out before him in its vital, vernacular power and making upon him an impression of beauty and majesty such as no translation, however excellent, can possibly produce. And to reach so desirable an end as this he will not, if wise, begrudge the labor involved. That labor to one who is fairly well grounded in the Greek tongue and has something of a taste for languages is not excessive. And with all the helps now at hand an accurate knowledge of New Testament Greek, together with a power of independent judgment as to the true meaning of the inspired word, is not beyond his reach. If he has that deep devotion to this word which should characterize everyone divinely called to expound it he will not consider slight changes of meaning unimportant, nor count his toil ill repaid when he has gained some comparatively minute advantage in the comprehension of eternal truth. As Bishop Ellicott well expresses it in the preface to his *Commentary on Galatians*: "If the Scriptures are divinely inspired, then surely it is a young man's noblest occupation patiently and lovingly to note every change of expression, every turn of language, every variety of inflection, to analyze and to investigate, to contrast and to compare, until he has obtained some accurate knowledge of those outward elements which are permeated by the inward influence and powers of the Holy Spirit of God. As he wearisomely traces out the subtle distinctions that underlie some illative particle or characterize some doubtful preposition let him cheer himself with the reflection that every effort of thought he is thus enabled to make is, with God's blessing, a step toward the inner shrine, a nearer approach to a recognition of the thoughts of an apostle, yea, a less dim perception of the mind of Christ. No one who feels deeply upon the subject of inspiration will allow himself to be beguiled into an indifference to the mysterious interest that attaches itself to the very grammar of the New Testament."

The importance of a knowledge of that grammar can be illustrated from almost every page of the sacred book and by citing in evidence any of the parts of speech. Take, for example, the article. It is a very little word, but its value was very imperfectly understood in the days of King James. For lack of regarding it our common version says (1 Cor. iv, 5), "Shall every man have praise of God," instead of "his praise." Other similar mistakes are found in Matt. xxiv, 12, "The love of many shall wax cold," instead of "the many;" John xvi, 13, "He will guide you into all truth," instead of "the truth;" and Rev. vii, 14, "These are they which came out of great tribulation," instead of "the great tribulation." Even the Revised Version, though it has corrected such glaring instances as the foregoing, has disregarded the article, with loss, in many other verses. See Acts xxvi, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 8; John iv, 22. On the other hand, it has inserted the definite article, without warrant from the original, in many cases where it would have been better to leave it out. "I am accused by Jews" (Acts xxvi, 2) is more strongly emphatic than "the Jews." "A son of a god" (Mark xv, 39) represents the exclamation of the centurion at the cross better than "the Son of God." See also Matt. xii, 41; Mark i, 3; 1 Cor. xiv, 4. The use or omission of the article with the different forms of the divine name in the original is very significant and instructive, though it cannot be closely followed in a popular version. Θεός, without the article, seems to throw the stress rather on the broad conception of the divine character, godhead in general; with the article it means *this* God, *our* God, the God of the New Testament. To say simply *ὁ θεός* gives a much less definite view of our Lord's dignity and divinity than to say *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. "Jesus" and "Christ" almost always have the article in the gospels and the Acts to emphasize their primary significance—the Saviour and the Anointed. In the epistles the article is generally omitted, the words having become recognized as regular proper names. "Holy Spirit" takes the article when the person thus designated is spoken of personally in himself; but when the reference is to his gifts or manifestations among men, as being "filled with the Spirit," "walking in the Spirit," the article is omitted. The subtlety of the Greek mind is well shown by some of its usages respecting the article, usages not possible to be transferred to our ruder tongue and not always to be grasped by our heavier Western brains. For example, abstract nouns sometimes have the article and sometimes do not, always with a difference, no doubt, to the Greek perception; and usually this difference can be felt by one who studies it, can perhaps even be stated, while no translation could possibly indicate it.

The voices, words, and tenses of the Greek verb are very rich in distinction which cannot be indicated at all in any compact English form. It is very interesting to notice the difference in the middle voice, especially in its dative or appropriative sense, denoting action for one's self, as contrasted with the active voice under the same circumstances or even in the same phrases. An instance is in Acts xvi, 16, as compared with Acts xix, 24. In the first passage the verb for "brought much

gain" is in the active voice; in the second passage, where we have the same phrase and the same rendering, the verb is in the middle voice, indicating, probably, what is certain to have been the fact, that Demetrius had a more direct personal interest in the gains of the craftsmen than the damsel had in the gains of her masters. The well-known difference between the aorist and imperfect tenses is rarely indicated in our common version, and not always by the revisers, even where it would seem the natural rendering. Even where for euphony or to conform to the genius of our language the aorist must be rendered by the perfect or the present, it is worth while to know that the aorist, and not a real perfect or present, is in the original; for these tenses are never used interchangeably. In Luke ii, 48, it is "Child, why didst thou thus deal with us?" instead of "hast thou dealt." In 1 Peter v, 7, "Casting all your care on him," the participle is in the aorist, indicating an act done once for all, rather than a continuous casting. In many verses we find the two tenses in close contact, but always with sharp distinctness. In Matt. xxv, 5, "They all slumbered and slept," the first verb is aorist—"They all nodded or dropped off to sleep;" the second is imperfect, to show their state. In Mark vi, 41, "He blessed and brake the loaves," are aorists for single acts; "and gave to the disciples," imperfect—"kept giving." Matt. ii, 4, "Herod inquired of the scribes," is imperfect—"kept inquiring," repeatedly; verse 7, "learned of the wise men," aorist, one act. In 1 Peter ii, 23, 24, the verbs which describe Christ's not reviling and not threatening are imperfect; but when it adds, "He bare our sins upon the tree," the tense is changed to aorist—"bare once for all." Many scores, if not hundreds, of examples could readily be cited where the imperfect is rendered in our English translation by the indefinite past tense, as though it were an aorist, whereas it is manifestly used in the original in its own distinctive sense. In the narrative of the woman with an issue of blood (Mark v, 28, 32), "For she said, If I touch but his garments," and "He looked round about to see her," the imperfects indicate that she kept saying and that he looked around more than once. So in Luke iii, 7, "John said to the multitudes," the imperfect shows that it is not a single utterance that is referred to, but the frequent or habitual trend of his teachings. In Luke x, 18, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven," the imperfect might well be rendered, "I was beholding Satan fall," that is, while you, my disciples, were expelling his subordinates. In Luke v, 6, the imperfect denotes that the nets only began to break, instead of being really broken. And in Heb. xi, 17, the imperfect is decidedly the right tense, for Abraham only began, or attempted, to offer up his son.

The study of the prepositions, both when taken by themselves and when taken as parts of compound verbs, is fruitful of profit and adds new interest to many passages. For instance, ἀπὸ νεκρῶν and ἐκ νεκρῶν must both be translated "from the dead," but they are not precisely the same; ἀπὸ is "from the outside," and ἐκ is "from within," so that ἐκ νεκρῶν denotes a more complete identification with the dead, "from among the dead"—a stronger expression. Both phrases are used in Luke

xvi, 30, 31. The preposition *διὰ*, with the genitive, denotes the instrument of the action; with the accusative, the ground of the action. An instance of the former is seen in Rom. xii, 3, "I say, through the grace given me;" of the latter in Rom. xv, 15, "I write unto you because of the grace given me." In 1 Cor. xi, 12, we have, "The man is by the woman"—*διὰ τοῦ ἀνδρός*; in 1 Cor. xi, 9, we have, "The man was not for the woman"—*διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα*. The same distinction comes in a single verse in Heb. ii, 10, "It became him for whom (*ὅς ἐν*) are all things, and through whom (*δι' οὗ*) are all things." The prepositions *πρός* and *ἐπί*, both used with the accusative case and both having the general meaning of motion toward or upon, are separated by the fact that *πρός* implies a reciprocal or reflexive action on the part of the person met, while *ἐπί* implies that the person or thing receiving the action is passive and makes no response. Thus *ἐπί* is used in Matt. vii, 24, "He built upon the rock," and Matt. xiv, 29, "He walked upon the waters." But we have *πρός* in Matt. xi, 28, "Come unto me," in Matt. xxiii, 34, "I send unto you prophets," and in John i, 1, "The word was with God;" for in all these cases the object of the preposition actively responds to the action indicated. Prepositions give force to the many phrases of which they form a part, a force which can by no means always be indicated in a translation, but which can easily be felt as an added element of beauty, picturesqueness, and power. Thus in Heb. xii, 2, *ἀπορῶντες* is not simply looking unto Jesus, but away from all else unto him. So *ἐπίγνωσις* is full knowledge, advanced instruction, given subsequently to the rudimental teaching.

There are many other little words besides the prepositions, like the particles, *μέν*, *δέ*, *ἀν*, *γάρ*, which can rarely be translated, but which have a modifying influence on the sentence, discernible by those acquainted with the Greek. The two negatives, *οὐ* and *μή*, are rendered by our one word "not," but they are never used interchangeably in the original. *Οὐ* is the objective negative, denies categorically, denies matters of fact, and so is common with the indicative mood; while *μή* is the subjective or conditional negative, denies matters of thought, and so is more common with the other moods. The answer "No" is expected to questions containing *μή*, the answer "Yes" to questions containing *οὐ*. "Is it I, Lord?" (Matt. xxvi, 22)—*Μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι*—that is, "It is not I, is it?" "Is this the Son of David?" (Matt. xii, 23,) that is, "This is not the Son of David, is it?" and "Am I a Jew?" (John xviii, 5,) that is, "I am not a Jew, am I?" all have *μή*; but in Matt. vii, 22, "Did we not prophesy in thy name?" *οὐ* is used, for an affirmative answer is expected. This difference between the objective and subjective use of the negative is seen with vividness in Matt. xxii, 11, 12. As a matter of *fact* the guest had not a wedding garment, which is expressed by *οὐκ* in the eleventh verse. In the twelfth the king inquires after the guest's mental attitude, "How camest thou in, thinking, I will not put on a wedding garment?" Here *μή* is required. The double negative *οὐ μή* is very emphatic and, especially where used with the subjunctive aorist, makes an extremely strong denial; but in most cases there is no attempt to indicate this additional

idea in the translation, though sometimes it is partly shown by the words "in no wise," "by no means," "not at all." It is this strong form of the negative which is used by Peter (Mark xiv, 31), "I will not deny thee;" by Thomas (John xx, 25), "I will not believe;" by Christ (Mark xiii, 31), "My words shall not pass away;" and again (Matt. xviii, 3), "Ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Perhaps in no respect does the reader of the original gain more than in being able to note the subtle play of *emphasis*, which supplies so much of light and shade to the narration and often conveys important modifications of the thought. The variety of inflections is so great in Greek that the sentences can be formed without reference to the grammatical dependence of the word, and a flexibility of arrangement is possible that gives almost unlimited opportunity for expressing the emphasis which with us would have to be indicated by italics or by the tones of the voice. There is hardly a paragraph or even a verse in the New Testament in which the regular collection of the words is not somewhat departed from in a way that the most accurate translation could scarcely recognize or reproduce. The New Testament abounds in synonyms, which are used with careful distinction in the Greek, but which are represented in English either by the same word or by words which do not convey equivalent distinctions. For example, *ιερόν*, used seventy-one times, and *ναός*, used forty-six times, are both translated "temple;" but neither could possibly be substituted for the other in the original without great loss or positive contradiction. So a great deal is lost in John xxi, 15-17, and in many other passages, by the fact that we have only one word, "love," for both *αγαπάω* and *φιλέω*, which express different kinds of love. The words *ἄλλος* and *ἕτερος* are both rendered "other;" but the first stands for numerical otherness, while the second signifies generic otherness, denoting a distinction in quality—a different thing instead of merely another thing of the same class. In Gal. i, 6, it is a "different gospel," not simply "another gospel," of which Paul speaks. In Acts vii, 18, it is a "different king," that is, one of a different character, who arose in Egypt after Joseph's death. In short, there are scores and scores of synonyms, whose study is a source of unending interest and profit.

The perusal of the Greek also brings out a great number of plays upon words, alliterations, and other niceties or peculiarities of style, necessarily lost in a translation. Instances of these are seen in Luke xxi, 11, *λοιμοί, λιμοί*; Rom. i, 29, *φθόνου, φόνου*; Matt. xxi, 41, *κακοίς, κακῶς*; Matt. xvi, 18, *Πέτρος, πέτρα*; Acts viii, 30, *γινώσκεις, ἀναγινώσκεις*; 2 Thess. iii, 11, *ἐργαζομένους, περιεργαζομένους*. Under the same head would come the instructive comparison of the different forms of expression used by the four evangelists in narrating the same incident, the words especially favored by each (Mark employs *εἰθέως* forty times), and the medical terms brought in so copiously and accurately by Luke, the beloved physician. A considerable number of ambiguities and infelicities, if not positive mistranslations, will be detected, even in the Revised Version, by the careful student of the original. There is room for two examples only,

both from Acts: in xxii, 25, "Tied him up with the thongs" should be "Stretched him out for the thongs;" and in xxiii, 3, "God shall smite thee" is better rendered "God is about to smite thee." Some things that look like direct contradictions in the English are readily straightened out by a reference to the Greek. For instance, in Acts ix, 7, it is said of the men who surrounded Paul at his conversion that they heard the voice, while in Acts xxii, 9, it is said that they heard not the voice. But in the former verse the noun following the verb is put in the genitive case, while in the latter it is in the accusative, showing that they heard part of the voice, that is, the sound, but not the words that were said.

In hundreds of cases there is a most impressive figure wrapped up in the original word, giving graphic power and vivid reality to the statement which is necessarily lost to the English reader. For example, in 1 Peter v, 5, "Be clothed with humility," or "Gird yourselves with humility," the verb is from a term meaning a slave's apron; and humility is thus stamped as the working virtue, employed in ministering, which we are to fasten on for a badge of our subjection one to another, even as Christ girded himself with a towel. In 1 Peter ii, 21, "Leaving you an example" is literally "a writing copy," something to write under or trace over. Many hundreds of other instances there are where a strictly literal rendering, not fettered by the necessity of preserving graceful English, brings out the strength of the thought more freshly and richly.

It is certain that there are many thousands of places where an English translation, the very best available, must fail to convey, with perfect precision, the thought of the original. A careful writer in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1863, gives the number of these places in Matthew and Mark as 2,326, or about one and one third to each verse. This was, of course, for the King James Version. In the Revised Version, according to our counting, there are about one third less. But the number in the epistles is fully twice as great as in the gospels. Anyone can see by looking over a Greek concordance to the New Testament that there are a score or more of English words each of which is used to translate from ten to thirty-three different Greek words and phrases; and there is an even greater number of Greek words each of which is translated in different places in the New Testament by from ten to twenty-two separate English words and phrases. If the two languages have so little correspondence as this in their vocabulary it cannot be accounted surprising, when all the other points of divergence which we have mentioned are also reckoned up, that he who would come at the real New Testament must read it as originally written. He who does this will find an inexhaustible field open before him and an ever-increasing delight gathering round his biblical investigations. He will feel that in doctrinal and controversial matters he is treading on the solid rock, and that in devotional pursuits he is brought into closest fellowship with those who have possessed the fullness of the divine Spirit. He can have no better occupation for his leisure hours or his busy moments, nothing that will do more to increase his efficiency as a man, a Christian, and a minister.

PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

SELF-MASTERY is at once the hardest lesson and the highest honor of existence. To dominate the animal world does not of necessity imply nobility of soul. Brute force is successfully overcome by human strength, directed by a masterful human brain to the best results; the muscular Samson, by the vigor of his right arm, easily tore a young lion in twain, and Hercules in his infant strength strangled the venomous serpents that would destroy him. Again, to discover the secrets of the natural world and add to the treasures of science does not necessitate personal dignity. Albeit such great souls as Humboldt, Audubon, and Agassiz lived close to nature's heart and drew therefrom her priceless secret, yet an investigator destitute of large sympathy with rock or flower or bird, passionate, envious, and so sordid in his soul that scientific investigation means to him merely a livelihood, may unfold the mysteries of creation. Nor does rulership over man imply moral excellence. The good kings and queens of history are in the minority. On the thrones of the centuries sit the Pharaohs, the Casars, the Borgias. Dissoluteness too often has lived unchecked in the palace; rapacity has held the scepter; cruelty has made the laws for the great kingdoms of history; and none the less in the present age—which optimists in their clarified vision are pleased to call the best of all epochs in human story—viciousness too often rules. In fact, there is legitimate room for the critic to question whether the race is making particular advance in practical morals. Virtue seems almost at a standstill. The surface indications show a resistless trend toward self-relaxation. It is the age of the sensuous man. He has come into a paradise adorned with flowers, odoriferous with perfumes, and rich with clustered fruitage. If Christianity was never more clear in its experience or more fixed upon the prize of its high calling, worldliness was never more determined, unabashed, or extreme. The old evils are newly vigorous. Gambling, whether upon the stock exchanges and bourses, on the race courses, or at the Baden-Badens of the two hemispheres, was never so fascinating in its glittering charms or deadly in its ruination. Alcoholism, like the hideous Medusa of story, fills the world with the noxious vapor of its breath; and what Perseus, himself free and fearless, has the prowess to rid the earth of the monster? Assault and murder come with every sunrise. Cain yet flames with anger at the superior merit and reward of his brother and strikes Abel to the ground. How little advance in self-government has the nineteenth century man made over primeval man! Progressive in all departments of inquiry, striding onward like a giant in archæological excavation, chemical experimentation, geological pursuit, *belles lettres*, or theological definition, he stands where Adam stood—face to face with personal tastes and tendencies that are out of consonance with virtue, and called upon in the exercise of his own sovereignty to build under such adverse conditions a personal character for the eternities. Nor is the difficulty of

the struggle for self-rulership to be underestimated. The true man would sooner dare all the lions in Trajan's arena than the rampant, raging passions of his own soul. Because the rewards of virtue, in men's opaque vision, appear so remote, so uncertain, so inconsequential, self-mastery does not seem worth the struggle; because the recompenses for worldliness are so visible and alluring, men consent to its slavery. And yet the permanence of civilization turns on self-victory. Convinced alike of the necessity and the grandeur of such a triumph, the wise teacher of Israel reckoned him who rules his own spirit better than "he that taketh a city."

THE transformation of New England is one of the later social developments which challenge the notice of all readers of American history. No section of the nation has less in its record of which to be ashamed or more for which to feel a glorious pride. What New England has been and done is an oft-told story. Favorably situated as to geographical location for playing the hostess to the visiting Puritans from Holland, near three centuries ago, she could not well have nurtured a lower type of nobility than that which she developed under their molding influence. Great statesmen have sprung into life and activity upon her favorable soil. Standish, Bradford, Brewster, and Carver, among the Pilgrim fathers, and the Winthrops, early governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut, were not men of small caliber. They were the worthy predecessors of Warren, who shed his lifeblood at Bunker Hill; of Israel Putnam, rugged hero of the War of Independence; of the elder and younger Adams; of Elbridge Gerry, Roger Sherman, and Oliver Wolcott, leading spirits among the signers of the Declaration of Independence; of Webster and Sumner, illustrious orators in the halls of our national legislation; of Andrew and Buckingham, the famous "war governors" of a generation since. Surely no section of the broad nation has been more prolific of great statesmen! In education, also, the older New England was at the front. Always the friend and patron of the public school, its elementary scholastic institutions were coeval with its first settlement. But it early grew ambitious also for colleges. In 1636—a remote period, as the rapid American reckons time—the foundations of the great Harvard University were laid at Cambridge; in 1700 the beginnings of Yale, its strong competitor, were made—both of them having their origin in the consecrated hearts and exalted purpose of Christian clergymen. Thenceforward liberal education has had no more loyal promoter than New England. Inducing students to seek her academic halls by the superior advantages she has offered, she long since became the schoolmistress of the nation. In theology, also, New England has attained to leadership. As the arena of Bellamy and Edwards, of the Days and Dwights, of the elder Beecher, of Channing, Starr King, and Theodore Parker, of the peerless Phillips Brooks, and as the burial place of George Whitefield, naught less would be expected of her than authoritative theological teaching. Inclining for the greater part to those sterner views

of life which follow belief in the divine sovereignty, she has, therefore, nurtured that type of character which exalts conscience above commercial interests and duty above desire. Martyrdom has been easy on her soil. The days of persecution ended, she is still the mother of religious enthusiasts, and out of the multitude of her sons has sent forth, without beggary to herself, stalwart Christian devotees to colonize the republic. Thrice hail to thee, New England, for thy illustrious record!

But the New England of history, like all things terrestrial, seems to have been passing through a transitional experience. With much that is great and noble in her present record she has yielded, nevertheless, to the commercial and secular influences of the day. Though she is yet a leader in educational and religious thought, other competitors have entered into the field to dispute her supremacy. Nor has she perpetuated her race of statesmen; but the time-serving, mercenary politician has long since entered her halls of legislation and filled those sacred shrines with the tables of the money changers. But in the shifting nationalities of the New England population is seen one of the most noteworthy of all mutations. The Scandinavian, the Irish, and the French Canadian have taken large possession of the fair land which the Puritans wrested from savage hands. Passing into the rural sections, they are acquiring ownership in farms; and, flocking in multitudes to the factory towns and manufacturing cities of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, they hold in their hands the preponderance of religious and political power. Protestantism, moreover, has become second to Romanism in numbers, incredible as the fact may seem to those who complacently have felt that New England was the very citadel of the Protestant faith. In the six New England States, by the census of 1890, are found 1,005,120 Catholic communicants against 763,987 Protestant communicants. Among all the sectional transformations in the rapid development of our American life, the changes which we note are among the most remarkable. To what they shall lead we may not prophesy. Yet under new conditions at least must New England work out the problem of her responsibility.

How far have the advances in invention affected human happiness? The presence at the naval reviews last spring, side by side with the highly developed war vessels of the world's maritime powers, of the caravels modeled after the three frail ships with which Columbus discovered this hemisphere was an object lesson not soon to be forgotten. The arrival more recently of the viking ship from Norway still further emphasizes the vast progress which the world has made since the days when Leif Ericsson and swarms of other hardy Norsemen scoured the northern seas, ravaging distant coasts and finding unknown continents. When Columbus set out from Palos, America was still unrevealed to the nations of Europe; Africa, uncircumnavigated and unexplored, lay wrapped in the darkest and profoundest mystery; Asia was a land of fable, knowledge of which was furnished by excited and unrestrained imagination. Learn-

ing had but just revived; printing was a new art; the Reformation was to be realized a generation farther in the future; Europe was Catholic; and whole histories, now familiar, were but unfulfilled designs in the mind of Providence. The viking ship carries us yet farther back into the past, to the times of the Danish invasions of England, when King Alfred held sway, and English—the greatest language the world has ever seen—was as yet an unborn tongue; to the foundation of Dublin and other Danish strongholds on the Irish coast; to the legendary times of Hamlet and Macbeth; to the times of the Carlovingians in France, when, but a century after Charlemagne, the vikings wrested from his weak successor the fair realm of Normandy; to the romantic settlements in Iceland, Greenland, and the misty Vinland; to the time when not a printed book was in existence, and men still believed that the earth was flat and stationary in space. These vessels are now in Chicago—itsself among the greatest marvels of the world—where are also on exhibit the actual first trains which ever ran upon American railroads. These, though vastly more modern than the vessels of which the caravels and the viking ship are models, still carry us back to the old days when a stagecoach ran twice a week from New York to Philadelphia, and once a week from New York to Boston, and when Chicago was merely a convenient portage at the junction of its river with the lake. What reminders are they of the changes occurring within the present century!

Yet it is a matter for discussion, after all, how much the happiness of mankind has been increased by the great improvements in its material condition. We are undeniably happier in some ways than were the peoples of the past, because less barbarous and more humane. Wars are now less frequent, are more quickly ended, and are not often accompanied with such scenes of pillage, of cruelty, and of lust as were common in other times. We do not now burn our brothers at the stake for a difference in opinion. Breaking upon the wheel has been happily discontinued, though four centuries ago this was a legal punishment in more than one civilized country of Europe. Yet perhaps the average man was as contented then as now; for happiness, after all, is subjective, and not so dependent upon outer circumstances as is sometimes imagined. In the times described in Genesis we find in full play the same passions of love and hate, of joy and sorrow, of hope and despair which make or mar our happiness to-day. The eastern patriarch lived to a good old age, surrounded with a healthful atmosphere of peace and domestic joy, and, after a life of pastoral simplicity, was gathered to his fathers amid the lamentations of his kinsmen. The tranquil shepherd on the Assyrian plains, studying the glories of the heavens in the calm silence of the starlit night, was perhaps as capable of happiness as the feverish merchant or manufacturer of our time. Humanity has ever sought for happiness; and in all ages has it found it, not in conditions depending upon invention, but in family and social fellowship, in the cultivation of philosophic contentment, and, most of all, in the religion which is designed to satisfy human unrest and aspirations.

THE ARENA.

"THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS."

THERE was published in 1735 a volume entitled *A Survey of London, Westminster, Southwark, and Parts Adjacent*. It contains, with other valuable data, a history of the origin of the above society, the oldest surviving Protestant missionary society in the world. The extracts from this work herein given are set before the reader *verbatim et literatim*. They will spread before his vision the coagency of Church and State in the Christianization of churchless emigrants to foreign fields as well as of native-born citizens of the colonies in the sustentation of parochial libraries and educational culture, and in ministerial supervision. This "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts" was organized in 1701, in the thirteenth year of the reign of William III. Says the record:

Another Society there is in London which was set on Foot by a generous and most extensive Charity to carry Religion all the World over, and it is called *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*. This Society obtained a Patent for making them a Corporation from King William, whose letters Patent bore date at Westminster the 16th of June in the 13th year [O. S.] of his reign; the cause whereof, as mentioned in said patent, was that in many Plantations, Colonies and Factories beyond the seas belonging to England, the provision of ministers was very mean, and many others of them wholly destitute and unprovided of a maintenance for Ministers and the Publick Worship of God. And, that, for want of Support and Maintenance of such many of the King's Subjects wanted the Administration of God's Word and Sacraments, and seemed to be abandoned to Atheism and Infidelity. And also for Want of Learned and Orthodox Ministers to instruct his said Subjects in the principles of true Religion divers Romish Priests and Jesuits were the more encouraged to pervert and draw them over to Popish superstition and Idolatry.

Letters patent were issued to the Society, embodying in the incorporation ninety-four members, "Bishops, Clergy, Nobility, and Gentry, enabling them to purchase 2000£ *per Annum*, Inheritance, and Goods and Chattles of any value." The act of incorporation provided for an annual meeting, to be held on the third Friday in February, "to chuse one President; one or more Vice-President or Vice-Presidents; one or more Treasurer or Treasurers; two or more Auditors; a Secretary; and such other Officers, Ministers and Servants as should be thought convenient for the Year ensuing." Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, was, by the act, made the first president of the Society, with instructions to "cause a Summons to be issued to the several members to meet within 30 Days after the passage of this Charter, and proceed to the election" of the other Officers of the Society, who were to continue in office until the third Friday in February, 1701 [O. S.], or until their successors should be duly chosen. The charter also provided:

The President, Vice President and seven members must be present and consent to every act so as to make it valid; the Society must, every year, give an account,

in writing, to the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, or any two of them, of the several sums of money by them received and paid out by Virtue of these Patents &c, and of the Management and Disposition of the Revenues and Charities.

The seal of the Society was orbicular. On the outer circle was engraved, in Latin, the name of the Society. The central part represented a ship under full sail bound to a foreign shore; natives of the distant lands are pictured on the seacoast with outstretched hands or on their knees; on the prow of the ship stands a minister, clad in priestly gown, looking toward those on the shore and "holding the Gospel open in his right Hand." In the interior is the motto of the Society: "*Transiens adjuva nos.*" In the sky above is the sun shining in meridian glory.

On February 15, 1702, in a general meeting of the Society it was agreed that all the bishops in the realm favorable to the Society should, through their archdeacons and other officials, issue a public call to all ministers who were willing to go forth as missionaries to send their letters to their several bishops, who should transmit them to the Bishop of London, who, after examination of the candidates as to their adaptation to the work, should assign to each one his field of labor. To aid still further this grand enterprise the Society issued the following proposal:

For Securing Parochial Libraries in the Foreign Parts; the Design of which was that men of Parts and addicted to Study be provided with such literary advantages in the Foreign Parts as they might have should they stay at home. And lastly: that every Parochial Minister in the Plantations have a Library of well chosen books in which he might spend his Time to his own Satisfaction and with Improvement and Profit both to himself and others.

The thoroughness of the plan is indicated by the following provisions: that a catalogue of books needed for such a library should be prepared by the Lord Bishop of London; that such a library should be sent to every parish in the foreign plantations (especially to Maryland and Virginia); that every library should "be affixed in a decent and large Room of the Parsonage-House of each Parish;" that, to prevent "loss or embezzlement," the commissary should inspect each library triennially and the parish minister be held responsible for any loss in his parochial library; that authors, clergymen, laymen, merchants, and others should be invited to make donations of books, money, or other means for promoting this philanthropic work. The indorsement of this plan is given as follows:

We do look upon this Design, as what will very much tend to propagate Christian Knowledge in the Indies, being they will in all Likelihood, invite some of the more studious and virtuous Persons out of the Universities to undertake the Ministry in those Parts, and will be a Means of rendering them useful when they are there. And therefore as we shall contribute cheerfully towards promoting of those Parochial Libraries, so we hope that many Persons will be found who out of Love to Religion and Learning will also contribute thereunto.

THO. CANTUAR.

JO. EBOR.

H. LOND.

W. COV. ET LITCH.

ED. WORCESTER.

SYMON ELENIS.

J. NORWICH.

To this Society the Methodist Episcopal Church owes an imperishable debt of gratitude. From these parochial libraries and the intelligent, warm-hearted clergymen who had charge of them the heaven-called Francis Asbury and many of our early fathers in the ministry obtained much of their reading, which, together with the Holy Scriptures, helped to make them men of wisdom, knowledge, and sound minds—princes in Israel, judges and rulers in the Church of God. In conclusion, let there be in the year 1901 a World's Missionary Convention, where all Protestant Christians shall come together in holy union and conjointly provide for the issuing of the sacred Scriptures in their own vernacular to every nation, tribe, and tongue on this globe. Then shall the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God. GEORGE A. PHOEBUS.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE RELATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN TO THE CHURCH.

THE position taken by H. C. Benson, in the May-June number of the *Methodist Review*, as to the moral and spiritual status of infant children appears to be the correct one. His conclusions are sustained by the Scriptures as interpreted by Dr. Scott, Richard Watson, Dr. D. D. Whedon, Bishop Merrill, and the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Infant children, by virtue of the unlimited atonement made by Jesus Christ, are subjects of the kingdom of God and heirs of eternal life. But what relation, if any, do they sustain to the Church?

In the Discipline, Paragraphs 43-48, we are told that by virtue of the spiritual status of young children they are graciously entitled to baptism and thereby placed in visible covenant relation to God and under the special care and supervision of the Church. The Discipline specifies that they shall be under the watchful care of the pastor, who shall see that their names are properly registered; that they shall be organized into classes with suitable leaders; that when they "shall understand the obligations of religion and shall give evidence of piety they may be admitted into full membership in the Church, on the recommendation of a leader with whom they have met at least six months;" and further directs the pastor and leaders and stewards' meeting to make provision for the Christian training of such children as may be deprived of Christian guardianship by orphanage or otherwise. The Discipline recognizes a possible vital relation between baptized children and the Church; but in fact, with the exception of a few churches, no such relation is maintained. The machinery of the Church is operated upon the "pound of cure" principle, rather than the "ounce of prevention" principle.

In foreign and domestic mission work, and in new fields generally such as our Methodist fathers cultivated, the chief energies of the Church may properly be directed to the restoration of the wanderer; and this will we do everywhere and evermore if the necessity be upon us. But it does seem that a well-organized Methodist Episcopal Church should receive the majority of her baptized children into full membership from the chil-

dren's classes, and not as converts from the outside world. And, alas, so many of them are not received at all! We put upon the lambs of the flock the Lord's mark, baptism, and then too often allow them to wander into the wilderness. It is not strange that when we seek them in after years they know not the voice of the shepherd and care not for the sheepfold.

Monroeville, N. J.

HOWARD J. CONOVER.

CAN NATURAL SCIENCE ACCOUNT FOR MIRACLES?

WE venture to affirm that it cannot, and for this very obvious reason: miracles are effects produced by divine power acting in nature, independently of nature's laws, in proof of the divine authority of a doctrine or in attestation of such authority in the person who performs them; or, in other words, they demonstrate the presence of divine power. Therefore they are outside the field of scientific research, and any attempt to explain them on purely scientific principles is, from the very nature of the case, misleading. For if they can be so explained they are thereby shown to be no more than effects produced by scientific experts, and those works that have passed as miracles were only masterly and successful scientific experiments. The most they can prove concerning the worker is that he is in advance of his age. Instead of being miracles they were, at most, only prodigies, and the notion of miracles is a mere concept or a figment of the imagination. There can be no miracle as a fact. Such successful experiments can no more prove the divinity of Christ than the achievements of Edison prove him divine.

For this reason I submit that any theory of miracles which omits the evidential element or assigns it to a secondary place is inefficient. If "the chemical affinity by which water was converted into wine is the divine power in nature," is not gravitation also? And are not heat, light, magnetism, electricity, and, indeed, all the other forces of nature divine? I can see no good reason for making any distinction in favor of "chemical affinity." If nature's forces are God's powers is not nature God? This idea is evidently based on pantheism, as making the creature and the Creator one. If "God is the ever-present source of all the forces in the universe and in the system of nature," and if in miracles "the force is not new," "but only its manifestation is new," then in what special feature do the so-called miracles differ from the startling scientific discoveries of to-day? The Bible view of the raising of Lazarus is that it was an act of divine power wholly transcending the powers of nature and in contravention of its established order. Whatever may be said of the life emanating from Christ, as "very God of very God," in the raising of Lazarus, we know that that event was not according to any law known in nature. Hence, the force which thus caused life to resume its course was new to nature.

As an evidence of divinity miracles must manifest power transcending any and all other powers. Hence, Christ came working miracles. I believe in Christ as divine because he proved himself divine and appealed

to his works as proofs of his divinity in the presence of his enemies, who were able to judge of his acts, having been eyewitnesses of them. Without this evidence we would not be able to rest our faith on him as very God of very God; for, it is to be remembered, pagauism claims many incarnations in its mythology. But our Saviour proved his divinity by "many infallible signs."

W. J. BARGER.

Sutton, Neb.

THE HOLY GHOST AND HUMAN TEMPERAMENT.

No man can save a soul. He can only influence the will, which is the executive department of our human nature, to yield to the claims of Christ, by faith in whom alone the soul is redeemed. But there are various approaches to the will; through the intellect, for instance, by the processes of argument and logical reasoning, and through the affectional and emotional nature, by the processes of kindly persuasion, by the use of pathetic incident, and in other ways.

Who is the most successful soul-winner—the man fully possessed by the Holy Ghost, and yet lacking in the attractiveness of a winning personality as indicated by all those details of carriage, voice, and happy combination of temperamental qualities by which man is drawn to man; or he who, wanting in all the elements of a deep spirituality, and yet persuaded of the truth, persuades to the truth through the medium of a nature richly endowed with all persuasive qualities? Of a company of ministers equal in consecration, intelligence, and energy some will be more successful in their fundamental duty of soul-winning than others. All ministerial success depends, of course, on the power of the Holy Ghost; but do not the personality, the inherent characteristics of some men better adapt them than others to be channels through which divine grace shall flow? Some are opaque, absorbing light; others are mirror-like, reflecting most of the light which they receive; still others are receivers but not distributors of truth.

Every true minister has a passion for souls; but is that passion in every case equally gratified? Many a minister whose integrity and consecration and all-absorbing yearning to reach men no one would question must yet remain content with meager results. "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you." Yes, indeed; but are there not differences of power? or, to shape the thought a little differently, are there not varying capacities for its distribution? Does not temperament count in the work of a minister? The water of life always satisfies a thirsty soul; but are the channels through which it is conveyed always sufficient? If by the power of the Holy Ghost alone men were to be persuaded of the truth the world ere this would have ceased its rebellion, for he is infinite. The antecedent to his coming is the preaching of mortal men; and his power is restricted by the mental and temperamental embarrassments incident to the human family, some members of which have been called to preach the precious truth of Jesus and his love.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

WILLIAM W. GILLIES.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

EXEGETICAL.—“ALMOST,” OR “WITH BUT LITTLE.”

ACTS XXVI, 28.

ONE of the passages of Scripture which our Revised Version has greatly changed is Acts xxvi, 28, 29. The revisers read, “*With but little persuasion* thou wouldest fain make me a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God, that *whether with little or with much*,” etc. The words italicized are those to which reference is here made, especially those in the former verse. The American company substitute, as an alternative reading, “In a little time” for “with but little persuasion,” and “both in little and in great, that is, in all respects,” for “whether with little or with much.” The stress of the discussion must rest on the change in the twenty-eighth verse, where our Authorized Version reads, “Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.” The proper interpretation of this passage is so important in its relation to preaching that it forms a fitting topic for consideration at some length in the Itinerants' Club.

The translations of some of the versions will show the earlier views of this passage. Wyclif's version, 1380: “And agrippa seide to poul, in litil thing thou counceillist me to be made a cristen man;” Tyndale, 1534: “Agrippa sayde unto Paul: Sumwhat thou bringest me in mynde for to be come a Christen;” Cranmer, 1539: “Agryppa sayde unto Paul: Sumwhat thou bryngest me in mynde for to be come Chrysten;” Geneva, 1557: “Then Agrippa sayed unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to become a Christen;” Rheims, 1582: “And Agrippa said to Paul: A little thou persuadest me to become a Christian;” Authorized Version, 1611: “Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou perswadest mee to bee a Christian.”

A reference to some of the commentators shows the meaning attached to these words by earlier and later theologians. Chrysostom says, “*Ἐν ὀλίγῳ* [that is, within a little, *almost*] thou persuadest me to be a Christian.” In a note it is said: *

It appears that Chrysostom supposes that Paul, as an *ιδιῶτης*, that is, not conversant with the elegancies of Greek style, did not perceive what Agrippa's phrase meant (namely, as here explained, *παρὰ μικρόν*), but supposed it to be the same as *ἐν ὀλίγῳ*, “with little ado”—that is, “Thou makest short work to persuade me, as if it were an easy thing, to be done in brief;” therefore Paul answers.

This is evidently Chrysostom's explanation of Paul's use of *μετὰ λίγο* in the next verse. The point to be noted is his explanation of *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* by “almost.” Calvin says:

Valla thought that it ought to be translated thus: “Thou dost almost make me a Christian.” Erasmus doth translate it “a little.” The old interpreter dealt more plainly, “in a little;” because, translating it word for word, he left it to the readers to judge at their pleasure. And surely it may be fitly referred unto

* *Library of the Fathers*, Parker's Oxford ed., p. 688.

the time, as if Agrippa had said, "Thou wilt make me a Christian straightway," or "in one moment." If any man object that Paul's answer doth not agree thereto we may quickly answer; for, seeing the speech was doubtful, Paul doth quickly apply that unto the thing which was spoken of the time. Therefore, seeing Agrippa did mean that he was almost made a Christian in a small time, Paul addeth that he doth desire that as well he as his companions might rise from small beginnings and profit more and more; and yet I do not mislike that *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* doth signify as much as "almost."

Grotius remarks: "Est locutio bene Græca. Nam et Plato dixit in Apologetico: *ἐγγὺν οὖν καὶ περὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐν ὀλίγῳ τοῦτο*, Prope idem de poetis cognovi." Meyer, on the other hand, translates, "with little," and quotes Œcumenius to the same effect. He says that most expositors either adopt the meaning, sometimes with and sometimes without the supplement of *χρόνῳ*, "in a short time," or "propemodum, parum abest, quia." So also Ewald, who calls to his aid the π of value, "for a little," that is, "almost." For the use of *χρόνῳ* in a similar connection we may note Plato's Apology.* We have the phrase *ἐν οὐτωσὶ ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ*. Alford and other modern commentators favor the view which has the authority of the revisers. We thus see that the current of early exegesis favors our Authorized Version "almost," while the later expositors favor "with but little."

We note, further, that almost all the earlier translators convey the idea that the expression of Agrippa was not one of contempt or irony by which he would reject the idea of any impression having been made upon him by Paul, but rather that an impression had been made upon his mind favorable to the religion of which Paul was the defender and representative. The state of the argument growing out of the contextual relations of these words will be considered in another paper.

THE FOUNTAIN THAT IS PURE.

In considering the sources of religious doctrine and religious life it is very important that we do not allow ourselves to be diverted from the true and only reliable one—God's revelation in the Holy Scriptures. Whatever may be found elsewhere in the world of science or the world of philosophy must be regarded as tributary to or a preparation for the "true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." He is found nowhere else but in God's word. In the Old Testament he is presented; in the New he is historically set forth. We have no satisfactory teaching in natural religion. Paul in his masterly presentation in the first chapter of Romans declares as the teaching of the natural world God's "eternal power and Godhead;" but no one who has ever thought independently of revelation has developed any character or life or mission at all comparable to that of Christ. Whether it be his person or his teachings which we study, we always find that which is beyond anything that men

* *Opera Platonis*, Tachnitz ed., vol. i, p. 43.

can produce. The only fountain out of which this pure truth concerning Christ flows is the sacred word.

The religion of nature has never developed the true scriptural idea of the origin of the world, the unity of the race, a complete system of morals, a firm doctrine of immortality and of future blessedness. Up to this time no era of thought at all comparable to revelation has proceeded from natural religion. What has natural science furnished that is at all helpful to the human soul? That in many things its opinions should be in harmony with the truth and in its own sphere be absolutely true we will not question. The laws of nature are uniform. Destitute of will nature knows no sin, and hence neither penalty nor forgiveness. It moves forward with a blind causality, destitute alike of hope or despair. There is no help in that direction such as many expect. A New York newspaper years ago gave extracts from several letters addressed by distinguished men to the founder of what was called a Theistic Church in that city. Max Müller, of Oxford, wrote:

The true religion of the future will be the fulfillment of all the religions of the past. The true religion of humanity, that which is the struggle of history, remains as the indestructible portion of all the so-called religions of mankind. . . . All here on earth tends toward right and truth and perfection; nothing here on earth can ever be quite right, quite true, quite perfect—not even Christianity, or what is now called Christianity, so long as it excludes all other religions, instead of loving and embracing what is good in each. Nothing, to my mind, can be sadder than reading the sacred books of mankind, and nothing more encouraging. They are full of rubbish; but among that rubbish there are old stones which the builders of true temples of humanity will not reject, must not reject, if their temple is to hold all who worship God in spirit, in truth, and in life.

Dr. James Martineau does not speak so encouragingly:

There seems to me to be several distinct sources in our nature from which the religions of the world have sprung, giving them most divergent values and necessitating permanent antipathies between them as ineradicable as between truth and falsehood, right and wrong. The antipathies wear out when the religions wear out, and that is the story of to-day. But I have more respect to monotheistic aversion to idolatry and nature worship in loyalty to the God of righteousness than to the modern search for sympathy in empty abstractions or æsthetic mysticisms.

Reading this passage between the lines, we should regard it more as a criticism of the theistic movement than an indorsement of it. Mr. O. B. Frothingham wrote:

There are three prevailing ideas of the source of religion: 1. That it was a communication by the supreme Mind and by it adapted to the intellectual conditions of mankind. 2. That it was an outgrowth from human nature. 3. That it was a divine communication in its origin, but was subject to the accidents of a changing and deviating race.

The last is the gospel which Mr. Frothingham preached so long in New York, and in the propagation of which he himself confessed that his Church was a failure. The Church's safety is in the truth of Scripture. As ministers of the word, let us ever drink from the sacred source, the fountain that is pure.

PRESERVATION OF MATERIALS.

(Continued.)

To all interested in the subject the following communication will be of special interest. In a private letter to the Editor its author writes : "As an evidence that missionaries are not wholly disinterested spectators of what is going on in the centers of civilization it may commend itself as worthy of acceptance at your hands."

EDITOR ITINERANTS' CLUB : Having profited by the experience of brother ministers, I would fain place mine at the disposal of young itinerants who, at the beginning of their ministerial careers, are casting about for a really effective and reasonably simple plan for obtaining a thorough and permanent command of the literature that comes within their purview, and are desirous more especially to be able readily and easily to utilize the wealth contained in their own libraries. The plan I have adopted, the practical operation of which for some years past has afforded unmixed satisfaction, is one that because of its manifest superiority has in my work permanently superseded two other plans. Brethren to whom I have recommended it are enthusiastic in its praise. My apparatus and its *modus operandi* may be described as follows :

First, I give every book in my library its distinctive number, by which to be identified as long as it remains in my possession. This is not necessary in the case of cyclopedias, commentaries, and dictionaries, though it may be a convenience to include these also. It is optional whether the number be affixed to the book. If affixed, it should be by means of a gummed label on the exposed lettered back, as near to the top as possible, to insure a longer and more cleanly lease of life. In the first few pages of what I call my *Library Ledger*—a specially prepared blank book of about five hundred closely ruled pages, duly numbered and provided with an index—I have an accurate register of all my books with their assigned numbers. In this *Library Ledger* I open a separate account in the appropriate place with every topic that has commended itself to me as worthy of reference in the course of my general reading, indicating under the proper letter in the index the ledger page on which references to books that treat of the topic inserted are given. At the commencement of topics embraced under the several letters of the alphabet one page is set apart for biographical and another for topographical references.

In making entries in the *Library Ledger* under particular topics much time and space are saved by making the number of the book which treats of any given topic a numerator, and the page of the book on which the particular reference may be found a denominator. To illustrate: I desire to read up on "Conscience." Opening my ledger I find that my account with "Conscience" stands on page 44. Turning to page 44 I find an array of references: "Not developed by nat. selection, $\frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{3}$. Not a separate faculty, $\frac{1}{4} \frac{2}{3}$. Needs revelation, $\frac{4}{5}$. Hypothesis of its development,

$\frac{24}{15}$," etc. In an instant I learn that on page 172 of *Blending Lights*, on page 478 of Dickinson's *Theological Quarterly* for 1882, on page 70 of Lid-don's *Elements of Religion*, on page 415 of Bowne's *Studies in Theism*, etc., I shall find helpful treatment of the subject in which I am specially interested at the time.

The exact scope of the material thus made available is indicated by two or three words in the ledger references, as shown above. This plan also works well in connection with my study Bible. In the margin opposite Rev. iii, 5, stands the fraction $\frac{185}{888}$, which tells me that on page 688 of vol. viii of the *Homiletic Monthly* there is a good sermon on this verse. Opposite 2 Cor. iii, 18, I find $\frac{239}{5}$, which introduces me to an exquisite gem of a sermon, Maclaren's "Transformation by Beholding." Immediately under the title heading of the Song of Solomon in said Bible $\frac{143}{4}$ refers me to Godet's *Old Testament Biblical Studies*, on page 241 of which commences his masterly critique on this perplexing book.

For the preservation of valuable newspaper and magazine articles I have an unbound expansible *Index Rerum*, consisting of separate detached leaves of stout pasteboard, lettered on the upper corners exactly in the same order as in Todd's *Index Rerum*. There are twenty-six larger boards, 10" x 8", representing the alphabet and the initial letters of topics treated of in the cuttings preserved. Between every two of these larger boards are five smaller ones, 6" x 6", representing the vowels. All stand on their edges on a shelf, occupying as much space as is needed by the constantly accumulating material filed away. It works thus: Finding an excellent editorial in the *Indian Witness*—"Why do Men Gamble?"—I cut it out, fold it up to convenient size, and after underscoring the word by which it is to be classified (in this case "Gamble") I proceed to place it. I look first for the large card, on the right hand upper corner of which is the capital letter G. Then, as the first vowel of "gamble" is a, I place the article between a and e. Then in my *Library Ledger*, at the account opened for "Gambling," I make an entry—"Indian Witness, art., I. R." (shelf *Index Rerum*). Suppose I want to read up on leprosy. I first go to my ledger, to find what I have discovered in my books and indexed on this topic. Then I go to my shelf, and from the space between L and M, after e, I take out half a dozen really valuable articles, which, after perusal, are carefully replaced in their compartment. This plan, to me, at least, is vastly superior to the scrapbook or envelope plan, both of which I tried. If one's reading of newspapers and fugitive current literature be extensive, and time for cutting out and filing away be available, he may have two or more *Index Rerum* shelves—one for "Religion," a second for "Science and Philosophy," a third for "Sociology," etc.

To a busy worker to whom every moment of time is valuable the adoption of the plan outlined above has been a much appreciated boon. I only wish I had hit upon it at the beginning of my ministerial and missionary career.

J. E. ROBINSON.

Poona, India.

FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

H. J. HOLTZMANN.

THIS great Strasburg professor is one of the largest figures in the theological world of Germany. His principal significance is in his New Testament work, and especially in his criticism of the synoptic gospels. Briefly summed up, his views are as follows: The motive which led to the first attempt to reduce the facts of Christ's life to writing was the growing feeling that the destiny of Christianity was not bound up with that of Judaism, but would live on into the far future. According to his view the chief interest of his disciples centered in the words rather than in the experiences of Jesus; and hence the traditional Matthaic collection of words of our Lord was the very first attempt of the kind. Next in order followed the gospel of Mark. These two works spread with great rapidity; and it was not long until an effort was made to combine the two into an harmonious whole. The first and most successful of these attempts to unite the two was our gospel of Matthew, properly so called, not because it was written by Matthew, which Holtzmann denies, but because the material furnished by Matthew in his collection of our Lord's words is that which distinguishes the first gospel from the other synoptical reports. The gospel was written with special reference to the needs of Jewish Christians. The last of the synoptics was our Luke. Holtzmann does not think that this gospel was written by Luke; but yet it is not without good ground that it is named after him, since it is probable that the influence of Luke is traceable in it. He admits, also, its strongly Pauline character, so universally recognized. It will be observed that here is a thoroughly naturalistic explanation of the rise of our synoptic gospels. Men wrote these books just as men write other books, because they think they see a need of them. There is here not the slightest hint that God either prompted them to write or gave them divine assistance in their work. On the contrary, he holds that our gospels do not merely describe what Jesus was and did, but also the faith of the Church concerning him. They are not simply histories, but dogmatic Christologies, somewhat nebulous, clothed in historic garb. He would not attribute this dogmatic history to a falsifying purpose, but to the inevitable workings of the human mind. Nevertheless, the theory is subtle and dangerous in the extreme. Our gospels are more than the expression of the early Christian consciousness.

SAMUEL OETTLI.

If you would know the theological position of a writer, test him on some crucial question. Judged by such a criterion this Swiss theologian is to be classed rather with the conservatives. He is ranked as high authority on many books of the Old Testament. But his ideas concerning Chronicles can alone engage our attention here. He firmly holds the

opinion that 1 and 2 Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah are the work of one author and are intended to form one continuous history, composed, as he thinks, about the end of the Persian period and the beginning of the Greek. As to the author, he surmises only that he was one of the Levitical singers. More far-reaching, however, are his opinions as to the spirit in which the Chronicles were composed. He observes that the author neglects the kingdom of the ten tribes in the interest of Judah, even calling the southern kingdom by the comprehensive name of Israel; that he excludes, even from the history of Judah, what does not serve his interest in religion and the Davidic dynasty; that he gives a great relative importance among the tribes to Levi, and dwells with special interest upon the ritual observances, the temple, the clergy, and the festivals; that he makes the weal or woe of the people to depend, not upon their moral but their ritualistic religious life. But after making all these concessions he rejects Wellhausen's interpretation of the facts, which he regards as a caricature. He denies that the author modeled his facts to suit a pre-existing judgment, admitting, however, that he places the material at his command in such relations as to suggest that he applies a true principle somewhat mechanically. He lays it down as a principle that a nation which finds no hope in the future seeks its ideals in the past. Hence it is that the author passed over the sins of David, Solomon, and others whom he represented as heroes, without mention. He explains the large numbers employed by the author as a matter of taste. When he comes to the question of the trustworthiness of the books he claims that they mention by name an unusually large number of sources, and thus prove that they were carefully written. He does not agree with those who see in Chronicles only the post-exilian conception of Israel's past. His final conclusion is that the books of Samuel and Kings are more reliable, but that we may with confidence avail ourselves of the history given us in Chronicles on points where other authorities are silent.

PROFESSOR J. MEINHOLD, OF GREIFSWALD.

RANKED as a conservative in Germany, Meinhold would be regarded in America as a radical. We can here only mention his views concerning the Book of Daniel as illustrative of his style of thought. With Dillmann, Graf, Hitzig, Kahnis, Delitzsch, and most other Germans, he denies the authorship to Daniel. On the other hand, he does not go so far as Delitzsch, since he denies that the whole book must be a product of the Maccabean age. Parts of it, including chapters viii-xii, were then composed; and none of it was composed in the exilian period. He thinks that the Aramaic portion (chapters ii-vi) was composed about B. C. 300. The author adopted well-known traditional stories concerning Daniel and his companions, and wrought them out in such a way as to show how the faithfulness of the captives in Babylon advanced the cause of God in the world. He assumed that these stories represented Daniel as gifted with special wisdom, and that his life was an exhortation to faithfulness.

God. It was according to the spirit of the times to clothe these exhortations to faithfulness in the garb of prophecy; and the firm belief of the people in the nobility and wisdom of Daniel made it eminently appropriate for the author to put all these things in Daniel's mouth. The Maccabean portion, chapters viii-xii, was placed subsequent to the Aramaic portion in order that the latter might lend authority to the former. To these the author added exhortations in the spirit of Daniel, of which chapter vii is an example. Chapter i, with the first three verses and part of the fourth verse of chapter ii, form the introduction to the whole. The purpose of the book so formed was to exhort the Israelites to faithfulness in the time of their great need. The book, however, is not a pious fraud, since the author did not set out to write a canonical book. Nevertheless, the Jews did right in adopting it into the canon, since it was in reality a source of religious encouragement in the period of the Maccabees. Furthermore, the traditional stories which lay at the basis of the Aramaic portion of Daniel were not fictitious, but were accounts of real events, at least in the main. These conclusions he bases upon linguistic, doctrinal, and historical data furnished by the book itself, the details of which cannot here be given. It must be confessed that Meinhold has the majority, even of the orthodox critics, with him. But the question, like many others, cannot yet be finally settled. Facts may yet be brought to light to confirm the authorship by Daniel.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

THE IDEA OF HOLINESS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE European custom of offering prizes for theological dissertations on subjects announced by theological faculties has elicited many excellent treatises. This is one of them, written by Ernst Issel, a pastor in Baden. At the suggestion of the Hague Society for the Defense of the Christian Religion, which offered the prize, he began his treatise with a discussion of the idea of holiness in the Old Testament. In the New Testament the fundamental thought in holiness is found to be separation from all that is profane (in contradistinction from sacred) and consecration of oneself to God. The term "holy" is not, therefore, equivalent to "pure" or "clean," since holiness is a far wider conception than purity. He raises the question how those conceived of themselves whom Jesus had sanctified, or made holy. One of the important elements is the consciousness of possessing the gift of the Holy Ghost. But they did not think of themselves as sinless, nor conceive the idea that in them every sinful impulse had been destroyed. Nevertheless, they felt the necessity of a pure life. Sin renders impure; nearness to God demands moral purity. Purity is the condition under which alone God can be seen. He is under the impression that Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. vii contains the germ of all the later asceticism of Montanism. But the gnostic principle, that nature is itself sinful, he thinks is not sustained in the New Testament. One of the strongest motives to sanctification is the early coming of Christ and the last judgment.

He thinks that in the word "holy" we have an illustration of how words may be employed in different ages of the world in entirely different significations, and is sure that the saint of the New Testament is an altogether different personage from the saint of the Middle Ages. That the conception of holiness was greatly changed is not to be disputed; but it was not so much in the elements which were supposed to go to the making of a saint as in the stress laid upon externals, to the neglect of the evangelical elements of personal Christianity. Issel's work suffers, like all others which take up but one side of the Christian life, from incompleteness. The Christian life is more comprehensive than holiness. It is to be hoped that sometime a treatise will be produced which shall afford a complete analysis of the true factors entering into a life according to Christ.

DO WE NEED A NEW STATEMENT OF DOGMAS?

IN 1889 Professor Kaftan published a small treatise, entitled *Faith and Dogma*, in which he incidentally mentioned the need of a new dogma, using the word very much in the sense of "creed." It caused great excitement, which he answered with the work now mentioned. He would not displace the old creeds, but he would restate the doctrines of evangelical Protestantism in the light of our present needs and our present knowledge. He claims that our present creeds do not command that obedience which is due to the Christian faith. He also asserts that the dogmas of the Church ought to show us, as they do not now, the true path of the Christian in his relations to his heavenly inheritance on the one side and his duties and enjoyments on the other. Another point which he emphasizes is that the old dogmas only measure the knowledge their authors had of the Bible, but do not correspond to our knowledge of the teachings of God's word. He complains that the old dogmas were in a large measure the statements of conclusions drawn from scriptural premises, and boldly asserts that we should omit all such from the dogmas of the present day, admitting thereto only those which are fundamental in the word of God. Especially does he feel that the dogma concerning Christ needs restatement. Faith in Christ moves about him as the glorified head of the Church and about his historic manifestation upon the earth. It completes itself by asserting the divine origin of Christ. Herein lies the energy of our faith. But farther faith does not go. All attempts to make clear the origin of Jesus Christ from God are speculations, thoughts which we have concerning the faith, but which are no part of faith itself. It is evident from all this that Kaftan is not a believer in a creedless Church; that he is fully persuaded that the Bible is the true source of all doctrines which are fundamental to Christianity; and that he thoroughly believes in the divinity of Christ. Whatever may be thought of the necessity for a new statement of theological truth it must be admitted that, although he is a follower of Ritschl, Kaftan is orthodox in the main. The same may be said of most Ritschlians, their fundamental principles touching only the more speculative parts of the creed.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, BY MARTIN KÄHLER.

THIS book is not a commentary in the ordinary sense of the word. It is not an introduction to the study of Hebrews; nor does it discuss the questions of date, authorship, or any of the ordinary questions with which introduction concerns itself. It is an attempt at an exact reproduction of the thought running through the entire epistle. It at the same time professes to give an exposition of the epistle. Yet it is not a paraphrase, although approaching very closely thereto. It is a sort of cross between a paraphrase and a translation. It helps to explain the meaning of the inspired author, but it does not help us in getting at the significance of the author's thought. None of the ordinary machinery employed by the commentator is exhibited. The work is all executed in the absence of spectators and the accomplished result put down in writing for our benefit. We have to take Kähler's conclusions, therefore, as a purchaser takes the compound which the apothecary mixes out of his sight—on faith. Here and there, indeed, he gives us a hint which is helpful. For example, in speaking of Melchizedek as a type of the high priesthood of Christ, he says, "The silence of the [Old Testament] report concerning his parents and tribal relations is emphasized, and in this nonlimitation of his life a picture is found of the illimitable life of the Son of God." This is really a paraphrase—a statement of a truth in supposed plainer language; and it is the purely paraphrastic portions of his work which lend it value by giving us Kähler's opinions. The only special advantage we see in such a work is that it takes up less space than the ordinary commentary. But it loses immensely in satisfactoriness. The method employed is only adapted to use in the professorial lecture-room, where the student can be sure that the results reached are accurately stated and that they thus leave the mind free to absorb and weigh the processes of thought by which the lecturer reaches his conclusions. But, while the method is not well adapted for general use, the work is done in a scholarly and scientific manner and, to the student versed in the exegetical problems of Hebrews, very suggestive. The basal idea, too, is one which needs emphasis, namely, that in order to understand the Bible as a whole we must understand each book as though it were the only book, and that the parts of a book can be best understood in their proper setting within the whole.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

RADICAL CRITICISM IN HOLLAND.

By comparison radical criticism in Germany is conservative. We need not refer to the extremes to which Kueenen went in his views of the Old Testament history and prophecy. A more recent case in New Testament criticism is more illustrative still. Reference has been made in the *Review* to Steck's views of the four principal Pauline letters. But Steck was preceded in Holland by Pierson and Loman, the former of whom says that it is a natural hypothesis that so remarkable a person as the Paul of Galatians

is not a reality, but the fiction of a Pauline Christian. And now that Steck has worked out a proof satisfactory to himself of the non-Pauline origin of every document of the New Testament, Völter, the Hollander, at least, agrees with him in reference to the Epistle to the Galatians. In Germany, on the other hand, he has found no supporters. Professor Van Manen, of Leyden, not only agrees with Steck in the rejection of Paul's four principal epistles, but goes away beyond him in his conclusions. The radical nature of his criticism may be seen by some comparisons. The Tübingen school was regarded as tolerably radical, but they held fast to Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians. Van Manen follows Steck in rejecting them, although the newer critical school in Germany, following largely in the path of the Tübingenites, defends them. While Steck contradicts the Tübingen school in rejecting Paul's four principal epistles he also contradicts them in defending the historical trustworthiness of the Acts. Van Manen, on the other hand, rejects both. He accuses Steck of being too conservative in his views of primitive Christianity and of not drawing decisively enough the consequences of his own critical opinions. He declares that it is not justifiable, because we must reject the historical Paul of the principal epistles, to seek for him in the Acts. To maintain the historical worth of the Acts is too conservative. The Tübingen school and Steck must have some sort of foundation upon which to build—if not the principal epistles, then the Acts. But Van Manen does not feel the need of either. He thinks Steck is too conservative when he regards Paul as a great historical reality, entirely apart from the genuineness of Paul's epistles. To him Paul is not a distinctly recognizable reality. The real Paul had little more than the name in common with the Paul of the principal epistles. These letters, he thinks, had their origin in gnosticism. Having now gotten rid, to his own satisfaction, of all the New Testament documents bearing upon the case, he regards himself as having at last found the correct method of constructing an historically veracious account of the true course of things in the first fifty or sixty years subsequent to the death of Jesus. The average man would feel that all historical construction was at an end when it was proved that there were no reliable sources of information. But Van Manen seems not to be troubled by this lack. There is one great advantage which his position affords him—he is left free to make the early history of Christianity what he will. These "sources" are often a great bother to an historian. He would like the history to have taken such and such a course; it seems to him that that is the way it ought to have been. It is a great grief to him that his sources do not uphold his judgment. But henceforth when any historian wants to find the true course of history in any period let him prove that all the documents hitherto supposed to have been contemporary are forgeries of a much later period, written in order to make things appear as their authors would like them to have been, and then he will be on the right road to a true solution. And nothing could be simpler than to do this; for if we have no trustworthy records of the life of Paul it would be easy to prove that we have no trustworthy records of anything. It is

this extreme radical criticism which disgusts even the moderately radical critic with all criticism, and makes all who study the subject suspicious of the conclusions reached in every department of historico-critical study, by whomsoever conducted. There is one great comfort in it all, namely, that such criticism sinks of its own weight and generally carries its authors down with it. It was so with Bruno Baur, who approached nearer to Van Manen than any other German critic ever did. We predict that it will be so with Van Manen, Steck, Pierson, Loman, Völter, and the smaller fry who take up with their opinions. Steck is a German Swiss. The others are Hollanders. Steck is conservative compared with Van Manen. Holland will gain no credit theologically from these men. She will lose the confidence, however, of all who are searching for leaders whom it will be safe to follow.

THE DEACONESS HOME IN STRASBURG.

THIS institution recently celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. Pastor Voegner, chaplain of the institution, read the report. He described the work done in 1842 by the founder, Pastor Haertner. The institution now numbers two hundred and three sisters, who are charged with the management of twenty-seven departments. Eight of these are in Strasburg, among which are the large hospital on the Elizabethangasse; the intermediate and the high school for girls, the former with three hundred, the latter with five hundred pupils; the Krippe, or children's home; and a home for convalescents. Other departments are located in Gebweiler, Mülhausen, Munster, Kolmar, and in various places in the canton of Neuchâtel, in Switzerland. Frau Adele Schneiter, who assisted Pastor Haertner in establishing the institution, still presides with unabated vigor over the home and its various departments of work. It was announced that the emperor had donated ten thousand marks to the establishment. The Statthalter appropriated six thousand marks from the public funds. The empress donated a Bible, in which she inscribed with her own hand the words of John xii, 26. The theological faculty of the Strasburg University and the directory of the Church of the Augsburg Confession sent congratulatory addresses.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

DURING the latter part of November, 1892, a congress of socialists was held in Berlin, which indicated by its action a lack of unity and consistency. It was even proposed that the congress should henceforth meet but once in two years. This proposition was strenuously opposed by Bebel, who declared that it was in itself an evidence of indifference among the members of the party. It was also agreed to abandon the usual demonstration on the 1st of May, except in so far as it could be observed in the evening. Many of the former favorite methods of warfare against existing conditions were confessed to be inadequate or even harmful. The "boycott" had been found a two-edged sword, doing more damage to those who wielded it than to those against whom it was

directed. This was also true of the trade-mark by which all goods manufactured by members of the party could be distinguished and thus bought in preference to those made by their opponents. It prevented their sale except among social democrats. The southern and northern factions came to an agreement according to which the congress declared that the party has nothing in common with State socialism; but it was evidently only a compromise, and left the division of sentiment as emphatic as before. The separation of the anarchists from the social democrats in Germany is a gain. But the party within the party, composed of younger men, are ready for any measure by which they can most hastily bring about their designs, while almost as much can be truthfully said of the opportunist section.

ANTISEMITISM IN A NEW FORM.

THE question has been raised whether the Jewish books on the subject of religion do not contain statements inimical to Christianity and morality. This question is to receive careful consideration at the hands of the Prussian minister of religion and education. It is expected that the result of the investigation will be officially made known. Meanwhile two hundred and fourteen German rabbis have published a declaration to the effect that the ethics of Judaism recognizes no claim which allows to others what is forbidden to Jews, and recommends to every man the endeavor to attain to the image of God; the severest exercise of veracity toward all, whether in trade or in society; the inviolability of every oath and promise to whomsoever it be given, whether Jew or non-Jew; the fulfillment of the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," without regard to nationality or faith; obedience to the law of the land; the expenditure of every possible effort in behalf of the welfare of the Fatherland; and cooperation in all efforts looking toward the mental and moral perfection of mankind. This is a tolerably high creed, but not in all respects just what we have thought we have witnessed in actual practice among the sons and daughters of Jacob. But these rabbis are speaking of their ethical teachings, not of their realization in actual life.

INTERESTING TEMPERANCE FACTS FROM MUNICH.

It has long been known that alcohol spares almost no organ of the human body in its ruinous effects. Recently it has been established by experts that the excessive use of beer produces affections of the heart. Munich affords a most favorable opportunity for such investigations, and here the deaths from heart disease are most frequent. The mortality of the general population of Munich reaches its highest point, among men, between the ages of fifty and seventy; among women, between seventy and eighty. Among the proprietors of beerhouses, on the contrary, the highest death rate is found between the ages of forty and fifty, among brewers between thirty and forty, and among the waitresses in beer halls between twenty and thirty. Among the causes of these deaths the most frequent is disease of the heart.

EDITORIAL REVIEWS.

SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

THE month of May witnessed in Washington City a season of the most anxious thought, when the General Assembly, the highest ecclesiastical court in one of the greatest Churches in Christendom, was pressed by a necessity which, without success, it had striven to avoid to the trial of one who, as an expositor of the Holy Scriptures and a teacher of theology, filled one of the most responsible and honored positions found in any Church. The Christian Church, of whatever denomination it may be, is too familiar with the difficulties it meets and has too intimate a knowledge of the often capricious reasonings of men and ministers in regard both to doctrine and practice not to feel a deep sympathy for any branch of the general Church which is brought into perplexity or grief through departures from essential faith or proper practice. The experience of one Church may be the experience of all. It is sometimes the case that men of superior education and acknowledged genius awaken the profoundest solicitude from the tendency of their thoughts and the trend of their teaching. No one who knows the glory of the Church of Scotland and of that wonderful genius and mighty preacher, Edward Irving, and the errors he imbibed and taught could blame the Church if, in loyalty to its great doctrines, it felt compelled to try and condemn him. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church was not unfeeling in its spirit or precipitate in its action because the trial of Dr. Briggs took place at its late session and because condemnation and suspension from the ministry followed the investigation of facts. If there was nothing that the professor could do, without compromising principle, to avert the result that was impending, then he may not blame the Church for strict adherence to the law which governs its action. No man may claim for himself a purer purpose or a greater wisdom than is found in the Church of his fellowship. We admire the modesty of true science. Not less should we commend deference to the highest authority of the Church we serve. If one claim integrity of mind in searching out the truth he must not reproach the many who with equal integrity adhere to and enforce the truth long since accepted and established. If the Church of Christ has any necessity laid upon it to do what men can do to prepare individuals to preach the word, then there is the most imperative demand that our young men shall be so taught the matters of belief as to impress them with the authority and the importance of the oracles of God. It was once said of the universities of England, by Rev. Jeremiah Sead, that they "were the eyes of the nation;" and it was added, "If the eye be single the whole body of the people shall be full of light." We may say of our theological seminaries that, if the teaching they give be evil, "the churches receiving their

preachers thence will be full of darkness" or suffer such obscurity as hardly to admit the assertion that they are "full of light." From the Union Theological Seminary, in which Dr. Briggs is professor, go annually from thirty-five to fifty graduates. Many of these in a few years may be filling some of the largest pulpits of the land. If, therefore, soundness is anywhere needed it should be required in such institutions; else was there less danger in the days of the fathers of the Presbyterian Church, when those preparing for the ministry, like those studying law and medicine, put themselves under the private tuition of men honored in their professions and capable of giving the best training to those who sought their aid. The moral alertness of all the Churches with regard to a true standard of faith will appear from the themes presented and the spirit shown in the current numbers of the various quarterlies. In the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for July we have "Some Recent German Discussions on Inspiration;" in the *Lutheran Quarterly* for July we have "The Higher Criticism;" and in the *African Methodist Episcopal Church Review* for July, an article similarly entitled. In the *North American* for July Dr. Briggs, in lucid language, expresses his hope for "a united Protestantism," "in which the Roman and Greek communions will likewise share"—where "they will continue to seek God through the Church and the reason, as well as through the Bible," and will remain a great constitutional party. Surely it will be confessed there is reason to be strong in the faith and to consider well the nature of ecclesiastical integrity. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

THE *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for July has: 1. "The Trial of Servetus;" 2. "Theological Thought Among French Protestants in 1892;" 3. "Homiletical Aspects of the Fatherhood of God;" 4. "Failure of the Papal Assumptions of Boniface VIII;" 5. "Metrical Theories as to Old Testament Poetry;" 6. "John Greenleaf Whittier;" 7. "Baptized for the Dead;" 8. "How Were the Four Gospels Composed?" 9. "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;" 10. "Some Recent German Discussions on Inspiration." The writers of the various articles show an ability that justifies them in the themes they have selected for discussion. "The Homiletical Aspects of the Fatherhood of God" is a timely notice, by Charles A. Salmond, and a timely rebuke of those who "sink the judicial altogether in the paternal aspect of God's character." "Baptized for the Dead," by Dr. T. W. Chambers, shows the reasoning of the thinker and the conclusions of the logician. "Whittier," by J. O. Murray, will be read with admiration both for the poet and the writer. "How Were the Four Gospels Composed" shows the broad scholarship, the deep research, and the conclusive reasoning of Dr. W. G. T. Shedd. Accounting for what is witnessed in many of the German theological writers, he says, "The unproven assumptions and almost innumerable hypotheses which have characterized German schools of biblical criticism since the time of Sa-"

ler are due to the substitution of the ecclesiastical origin of the gospels for the apostolic." And he asserts that "there will be no improvement in this class of exegetes until there is a return to the apostolical origin of the gospels." These are the weighty utterances of a strong thinker and a clear observer.

THE *Lutheran Quarterly* for July has: 1. "Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession;" 2. "The Church;" 3. "The Higher Criticism;" 4. "The Power of the Keys;" 5. "Faith and Regeneration;" 6. "The Preexistence of the Soul;" 7. "The Devil the Prince of the World;" 8. "The Word of God in the Sacraments." These subjects are of the first importance, and are skillfully treated. The article first named, by Dr. P. Bergstresser, is of great value to all who would know this branch of the Church in its high purpose to exhibit the true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

THE *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ* for July contains: 1. "Conscience;" 2. "Intellect;" 3. "Our Church Schools from a Teacher's Standpoint;" 4. "Christian Civics;" 5. "Rev. Benjamin Franklin Booth, D.D.;" 6. "Justification;" 7. "Sanctification;" 8. "Comparison of *Horæ* in Paul's and James's Epistles." The first article, by Dr. C. A. Burtner, is an able argument to prove the infallibility of conscience, especially when "in harmony with the teachings of revelation." The second, by S. S. Hough, treats of the place, authority, and use of the intellect in matters of religion. Dr. M. R. Drury considers the nature, instrument, and fruits of justification. In "Sanctification," by Professor G. P. Hott, it is asserted and sustained that the doctrine is "as old as the Bible" and is "clearly set forth in both the Old and New Testaments."

THE *New Jerusalem Magazine* for July has many articles worthy of more than a passing notice. Among them is "The Training of the Will," by John T. Prince. He asserts that "The human mind is a wonderfully complex organism," shows the distinction between the intellect and will, and impresses the value of the training of the will not less in childhood than in maturity. Warren Goddard discusses the possibility and advantages of self-restraint, and recommends its cultivation.

THE *African Methodist Episcopal Church Review* for July contains the following: "The Free Coinage of Silver;" "The Higher Criticism;" "The Philosophy of Progress;" "British Guiana;" "Rev. Theophilus Gould Steward, D.D.;" "Temperance in the Public Schools and the Sunday Schools Equally Essential;" "Literature a Pillar of Strength;" "Africa and the Educated and Wealthy Negroes of America;" "A Southern City: Reflections;" "Niobe;" "In Memoriam—Bishop John M. Brown." "The Higher Criticism" is a calm and Christian consideration of the subject by Bishop B. T. Tanner. "Temperance in the Public Schools and the Sunday Schools," by Rev. John W. Norris, shows a mind awake to

the duty of arming our youth against the evils of intemperance, and a knowledge of the best methods of encouraging those habits so necessary to success in business and to usefulness in the Church. "Literature a Pillar of Strength," by Professor John R. Hawkins, enlarges upon the service of a noble literature in building up the greatness of nations and of races. A just tribute is paid to the memory of Bishop Brown by O. W. Knight, who knew his character, appreciated his ability, and would perpetuate the influence of his ministry and honor his noble deeds.

THE *North American Review* for July has: "The Future of Presbyterianism in the United States;" "Divorce Made Easy;" "Ireland at the World's Fair;" "How Distrust Stops Trade;" "The Anti-Trust Campaign;" "Silver Legislation and its Results;" "Should the Chinese be Excluded?" "Norway's Political Crisis;" "The Fastest Train in the World;" "French Girlhood;" "International Yachting in 1893;" "The American Correspondence of Lord Erskine;" "Natural History of the Hiss;" "The Family of Columbus." The article on "Divorce Made Easy," by Professor S. J. Brun, shows the painful consequences of our lax legislation. "Silver Legislation and its Results," by Hon. E. O. Leech, is especially pertinent at this moment. "Should the Chinese be Excluded?" is debated in two very able articles. The one against their exclusion, by Colonel R. G. Ingersoll, is very forceful. That in favor of exclusion is by Hon. T. J. Geary, and presents in a clear style the strongest points on that side of the question. "The Family of Columbus" is written by the Duke of Veragua. Its authorship, as well as the history it presents of that courageous and wonderful man to whose memory we are justly rendering such honor, will induce a careful reading. It will impart to many an accurate knowledge concerning the discoverer which they will be pleased to retain.

THE *Treasury of Religious Thought* for July is worthy the title it bears. Its thought is broad and clear, but religious, as the offspring of the heart. "A Lazy Church," by Rev. Frank M. Goodchild, contains a just rebuke and suggests a needed correction; "Honesty in the Pulpit" deals with the preacher, his position, his themes, and the material for his discourse. The tendency in much of present literature to disparage the Scriptures by unjust criticism and false interpretation of difficult passages is pointed out in "Questions of the Day."

THE *Review of Reviews* for July seems like a world of literary thought, an exhaustless storehouse of useful knowledge. "Two Giants of the Electric Age" may convey some idea of the intensity of thought, the self-oblivion, and the resolute determination which are exhibited by men of great scientific purpose and achievement. In "Thomas A. Edison, Greatest of Inventors," by Charles D. Lanier, we are presented with a splendid example of the force of will, of the self-denial, and of the concentrated

action of all the faculties which are necessary for the attainment of all remarkable scientific renown. The second article under the above caption is upon "Sir William Thompson, Lord Kelvin," by J. Munro. In the line of thought which engages him Lord Kelvin stands unrivaled "in the ranks of science at the present time." His work on the Atlantic cable was a great contribution to the ultimate success of that enterprise, which was "repeatedly baffled and postponed."

THE contents of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* for July show assiduity in carrying out the purpose of this periodical. It is certainly a most successful means of perpetuating the memory of men, families, characters, and facts which render history of interest and of value.

THE *Preacher's Magazine* for July contains valuable hints for a judicious divine. He will do well to study with care, under "Present-Day Preaching," the sermon upon "Curiosity and Obligation," by the Rev. Thomas G. Selby. "How Men Get Their Sermons," by a London minister, may stimulate the thought how not to get them. They will be wise who avoid the wrong and practice the right way of getting them. There are sermons that largely make themselves from the heart as truly as from the intellect; and some sermons make men.

IN the *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, for July we are first presented with a sketch of the life and labors of "Albert Taylor Bledsoe," by Wilbur F. Tillett. He was a scholar, a professor in various colleges, and a writer of great metaphysical penetration and skill. Jefferson Davis, who was a student with him at West Point, said that "he considered Dr. Bledsoe the greatest intellect that our country has produced." His principal work is his *Theodicy*. Its profundity frightened many publishers, who could not foresee the success of such a book; but the New York Methodist Book Concern accepted it, and it speedily passed through many editions. It is a work through which the dead author still lives and speaks. It has power in purpose, plan, and execution. "Moravian Missions," by Eugene R. Hendrix, describes the results of that missionary spirit in which Zinzendorf and Wesley stood soul to soul. "The Law of Sanctification," by W. M. Leftwich, may edify others as well as Methodists.

THE *Nineteenth Century* for July contains, among other live articles on interesting subjects, one suggested by the season—"Some Day Dreams and Realities," by Rev. Harry Jones, who tells us what he thinks the best way to enjoy the country. "Great Britain as a Sea Power," by the Hon. T. A. Brassey, is worthy of study by all Americans. The cost of maintaining naval strength is a fact which should have weight with other nations. "The Apostles' Creed," by Professor Harnack, is honest and thorough in its examination of the origin and history of that venerable formula.

THE *Presbyterian Quarterly* for July has: 1. "Natural Religion and the Gospel," by John L. Girardeau; 2. "The True and the Fictitious Jesuits," by Charles C. Starbuck; 3. "The Way of Peace," by James A. Waddell; 4. "The Book of Esther," by A. Huizinga; 5. "Voluntary Societies and the Church," by C. R. Vaughan. In "Natural Religion and the Gospel" the points of difference are clearly and forcibly presented, and exhibit our only hope in the Son of God. "The True and the Fictitious Jesuits" is a carefully considered and well-presented article. In the third article the way of peace is seen to be simple and easy. As to Christian doctrine, fellowship, and practice every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind. Peace with God makes peace among Christians possible. "Voluntary Societies and the Church" is a consideration of the proper relations of such societies to the Church.

THE *Chautauquan* for July is a "summer number," is full of racy articles, and may make many an hour pass with the amusement, instruction, and mental quickening that are justly associated with this season of seclusion from care and relaxation from rigid duty. The first article, "Holland House," by Eugene L. Didier, is full of fascination. The history of this mansion carries the mind back nearly three hundred years, and shows us former lovers and patrons of "art, of literature, of science, of oratory, of genius and talent of every kind." We observe great men and women in the various aspects which their characters present. We see the origin and the fall of the house where royalty cast its eye of admiration on female beauty; where Sheridan, the "player's son," charmed princes and nobles by his wit; where Chesterfield revealed his grace of manner; and where Charles James Fox found mental delights after the triumphs of his eloquence in the senate. Here Johnson and Addison and Sydney Smith and Lord Macaulay and Byron and Tom Moore had a place and influence. But time has wrought its changes, and it is only the glory of those names and times that remains. "Sources of Literary Inspiration," by Georgia Allen Peck, though brief, is suggestive, and wisely teaches that "perfunctory work is not inspired and is seldom inspiring." Natures may be found that "give their best spontaneously;" but the majority need the inspiration which comes from high purpose and from contact with gifted and noble personalities.

THE *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for August contains many articles of interest and edification. "More Discoveries in Egypt" is a tribute to the faith and courage of the explorer. In what Egyptology has yielded to history and furnished in support of the Scriptures there is no slight compensation to the painstaking and self-sacrifice involved. A notice of the life and labors of "Hester Ann Rogers" impresses the value of a character in which God is the first thought and "Christ is all and in all." Her example was a living sermon and her holiness an acknowledged power. She was one of the earliest and brightest illustrations among

Mr. Wesley's followers of a zeal that was inspired by knowledge and constrained by grace. Mr. Wesley's confidence and commendation were the result and expression of close observation. Her biography is an abiding power in the Christian literature of the Church. "The Substance of a Paper Read at a Convention of Class Leaders in York, March, 1893," shows the power for good possessed by the class leader as a subpastor and the wisdom and piety necessary to prepare a man for that responsible place. It is refreshing to think of the seasons spent under the spiritual tuition of the godly persons who in the class room have taught us the deep things of God. "Notes on Current Science" describe recent valuable discoveries in material things, and show the need of such investigation as guards life, affords secular gain, promotes the general good of society, and renders us familiar with facts which broaden our conceptions and knowledge of God in all the work of his hands.

THE *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* for July contains articles of abiding interest: "The Prophecy of Malachi;" "Agnosticism: its Ethical and Religious Tendencies;" "Psychology;" "The Witness of the Spirit;" "The Nature of Christ's Atonement;" "The Land Shall Not Be Sold Forever;" and "Bible Study." Each article contains material for intellectual elevation, for moral improvement, and for the deliverances of the pulpit. In the first article, "The Prophecy of Malachi," we see in the last of the prophets a servant of God whose brief predictions project their benefits through all time. The article upon agnosticism reveals its characteristics and fruits. That upon psychology increases mental penetration. The witness of the Spirit was among the most joyful and influential facts of original Methodism, and remains a power that tells in other Churches. The third installment of "The Nature of Christ's Atonement" discusses the "Attributes of God." "Bible Study" continues the exposition of Paul's missionary journeys as described in the Acts of the Apostles.

THE *Andover Review* for July-August has: 1. "The Place of Christ in Modern Thought;" 2. "Socrates Once More;" 3. "A Case of Social Myopia;" 4. "Missions and Colonies;" 5. "The Liberal and Ritschlian Theology of Germany." "The Place of Christ in Modern Thought," by Professor C. A. Beckwith, is a critical and elaborate presentation of the question. "Loyalty to the Christian facts" has compelled the author "to affirm both the sinless perfection and the proper divinity of our Lord." The result of his investigations leaves upon him "two strong impressions as to this whole subject. One is, that the supreme duty of our time is to gain and guard an accurate knowledge of the historic Christ; the other is, that we must be absolutely guided in our apprehension of him by what he knew himself to be—the Son of God and Son of man, the Saviour of the world." The fifth, by Professor Frank C. Porter, presents Ritschl as standing, not in a school that advocates definite critical and doctrinal views, but for a certain starting point and method which

are indicated by comparison with Schleiermacher, with whom he differs as to the subjectivity of religion. It is not claimed that they had equal originality, or that much of Ritschl's knowledge was not derived from Schleiermacher. The editorial, "Professor Huxley on Ethics *versus* Evolution," is keen and just. In the realm of morals the assumed law of evolution is seen not to hold, for men develop into the bad and worse as really as into the good, better, and best.

THE *Missionary Review of the World* for August contains many articles in which the soul finds comfort, inspiration, and strength in pondering. "God's Season Man's Opportune Hour," by Dr. A. T. Pierson, is an illustration of his topical faculty, his Christian spirit, and the hopefulness he shows in his labors. He who, being in slumber, wakes not from his sleep in reading this has need of a voice from the cloud. "The Present Aspect of Missions in India" should warm a cold brain, and might cause the tongue of the dumb to speak. The "Department of Christian Endeavor" is ably conducted, and affords encouragement to all who work for God and study duty.

IN the *Fortnightly Review* for July, among other valuable articles, the first, "A Visit to Prince Bismarck," by G. W. Smalley, will take and hold the attention. "The stream of his life flows on, as it has ever flowed, 'brimming and bright and large.'" "And if one may not say that there is something infinitely pathetic in his comparative solitude at Friedrichsruh, it is permissible to see in his attitude all the old dignity and an unshaken firmness of soul." "Advance of the United States During One Hundred Years," by Dr. Brock, is a carefully prepared statement of facts and a forcible presentation of his conclusions as to the present relative greatness and future hopes of this country. Through "the application of steam and electricity, the construction of new lines of railroad, the opening up of large areas of new territory, the extension of lines of telegraphs, constant improvement in all classes of machinery, new inventions by which labor is made easy and hours of labor are shortened, the greatly increased facilities for educational and religious culture," a wonderful progress has resulted, which has made a small people numerous and a little nation in its origin in some respects the mightiest of the earth. "French Movements in Eastern Siam," by Sir Richard Temple, is a timely subject presented in an interesting manner.

THE *Biblical World* for July has a wide range of thought and themes. —The *Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature* for July, by the mental food it furnishes, gives keenness to the appetite and strength to the system. —The *Chautauquan* for August is full of taking matter. "What Makes a Methodist," by Dr. J. M. Buckley, is clear and comprehensive. —The *Preacher's Magazine* for August contains a sermon by Dr. Hugh Macmillan, as well as the conclusion of Mr. Selby's sermon in the July number.

BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES.

A COMPLAINT AGAINST THE REVIEWER.

AN eccentric but well-beloved great man finds fault as follows: "In old times what a delicious thing a book used to be in a chimney corner, or in the garden, or in the fields, where one used really to read a book and nibble a nice bit here and there if it was a bride-cakey sort of book, and cut one's self a lovely slice, fat and lean, if it was a round-of-beef sort of book. But what do you do with a book now, be it ever so good? You give it to a reviewer, first to skin it, and then to bone it, and then to chew it, and then to lick it, and then to give it you down your throat like a handful of *pillau*. And when you've got it you've no relish for it after all." The authorship of this unique bit of querulousness will be known at a glance to some readers, guessed by others from the tone and style, and can be inquired for by any, whom it may concern. Precisely what the great man means we are not sure that we comprehend; but we gather that he is for some reason considerably displeased with the reviewers. Nevertheless, we still suppose that the reviewer may have his proper and useful function in the scheme of culture. If the complainant would take the trouble to be explicit and define our faults we might learn how to mend our ways. Failing this, we see no course for us but to proceed as usual with the work which is expected of us in this department of our *Review*; and we hope and assuredly believe, notwithstanding the complaint of a rarely fine but irritable genius, that it may be possible for us, by care and diligence and judicious helpers, not to deprive reading of its relish, but rather to render some serviceable assistance to readers of the *Methodist Review* in reporting, so far as space allows, what fresh and inviting books of merit in the various departments of literature are upon the market. Accordingly we offer them the notices which follow, selecting for special mention: *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, by H. P. Liddon; *Let Him First Be a Man*, by W. H. Venable; *The Life and Work of John Ruskin*, by W. G. Collingwood; *The Puritan in Holland, England, and America*, by Douglas Campbell.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. 8vo, pp. 309. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$4.

It is in the order of a benign Providence that the products of a highly endowed intellect, an educated mind, a sanctified ambition, and a consecrated course of labor should perpetuate the usefulness of one whom death has removed. Not less than the skill of the warrior or the wisdom of the statesman do the achievements of the deep thinker on divine truths and of the sound expositor of difficult Scripture deserve to be honored by pos-

terity. Canon Liddon was by genius, education, and theological training possessed of rare qualifications for the work he attempted in departments of deepest thought. Though a voluminous author, his works all honor him, and none more than those in the most difficult departments of his study. His sermons preached before the University of Oxford and his Bampton Lectures on "The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" place him before the world as one of the best thinkers and writers and one of the greatest men that the Church of England or any other Church has produced in the century. His *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* suffers nothing from being posthumous, as it was prepared and intended for publication by Canon Liddon after years of labor, and little was left for the editor to do. It is the work of one man, and he one of the most fully furnished scholars of the age, whether we regard his acquaintance with the literature of the original text of Scripture, or the writings of the fathers, or the work of mediæval theologians, or the current productions of his own day. Canon Liddon was a High Churchman and entertained advanced views in regard to the eucharist; but as contradistinguished from the rationalists of Germany he was thoroughly orthodox. For Teutonic speculations he showed a positive repugnance, and, while familiar with the writings of its distinguished authors, spoke of its teachings as "misty magniloquence" and of its learning as "laborious pedantry." As a commentator the original languages of the Scriptures are constantly before him; collateral passages are critically compared; and thus the meaning of the sacred text is seized and appropriated with the earnestness of a mind intent on the understanding of the divine Author. He evades no Scripture because of the difficulty it presents. He is impressed with what he learns of "the remains of preadamite men in the strata of an unknown antiquity," and thinks they may well point to ages when the globe was the scene of the probation of earlier races of men; but he holds that the apostle's argument (Rom. v. 12) "assumes the organic unity of the present human race, and is inconsistent with any such hypothesis as that of several originally distinct pairs." He is unable to determine whether the seventh chapter is the language of the "regenerate" or the "unregenerate" life, the soul seeking or the soul after it has found God. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters engage his deepest thought. He clearly discriminates between divine foreknowledge and foreordination, and asserts that there is no succession in God's thoughts and resolves, and that predestination in respect to his creatures "must be in strict harmony with the eternal moral law of God's nature, with that unerring justice and love which is God." He impresses the fact that the Jews were foreordained to be his chosen people and, believing that the "gifts and calling of God are without repentance," expects his ancient people yet to return. But such foreordination is shown not to shut out the "other sheep" he has in the Gentile world. He disallows the theory that the final perseverance of the saints makes their salvation independent of responsibility and free will, and insists, 1. "That grace is indefectible, since man may fall from it; 2. That, having been

forfeited, it may be recovered; 3. That, viewed from the human side and in each particular case, predestination is not to be deemed absolute." The expository pervades the volume, but he is also dogmatic and practical. His analysis is keen, constant, and complete. The logician appears on every page. In language he is terse, direct, and lucid. In this work of so much learning we have looked in vain for a careless passage, a slovenly sentence, or an unguarded expression. There is no commonplace thought and no language that degrades rather than exalts its subject. It is a book to be studied; and the careful student may find much in his analysis to afford aid in homiletic labor. We have in Canon Liddon two powers that rarely meet in one man—those of a grand teacher and of an able exegete. He who addressed with a voice of the profoundest earnestness and influence the popular assemblies that crowded St. Paul's Cathedral or the scarcely less enthusiastic gatherings at the University of Oxford has left us, in his work on the Epistle to the Romans, a monument of his strength and skill in encountering some of the greatest difficulties of revelation.

Guide to the Knowledge of God. A Study of the Chief Theodicies. By A. GRATRY, Professor of Moral Theology at the Sorbonne. Translated by ABBY LANGDON ALGER. With an Introduction by WILLIAM ROUNSEVILLE ALGER. 8vo, pp. 469. Boston: Roberts Brothers. Price, cloth, \$2.50.

This is a book for the few, not the many. It will be of value to the professor of systematic theology and to that small body of persons who unite metaphysical minds with a deep interest in religious things. It is of special interest to Protestants, in that it affords within reasonable and readable compass a very complete synopsis of the views of the leading theological authorities of the Roman Catholic Church on so important a topic as the philosophical proofs for the existence of Deity. Beginning with Plato and Aristotle, it traverses also the arguments of Augustine, Anselm, and Thomas Aquinas, and then, passing to the seventeenth century, thoroughly sets forth the positions of Descartes, Pascal, Malebranche, Fénelon, Petau, Thomassin, Bossuet, and Leibnitz. So convenient and reliable a *résumé* of these authors is probably found nowhere else, certainly not within the compass of English literature. The treatment of the matter in debate—whether or not a complete demonstration of the existence of God can be achieved by the reason—is masterly; and, although perhaps nothing that will be accounted especially novel by Protestant thinkers is brought out, and most certainly different minds will continue in the future, as they have in the past, to put different estimates on the validity of such demonstration, it is a decided advantage to have the thoughts of these great men of bygone centuries placed so conveniently within our reach. Particularly in this age of blatant materialisms and atheisms of all sorts is it refreshing to read these pages, wherein the fundamental faith of Christendom is so strongly and clearly presented by intellects of the first class. Very many Protestants of the present day, in their pardonable disgust at the perversions and corruptions of current

popular Roman Catholicism, are too apt to forget the unquestionable fact that the Roman Catholic Church holds firmly the primal verities of Scripture truth and is for us an indispensable ally in the warfare with godless, anarchic infidelity. Professor Gratry, whose character and life, we are glad to learn from the Introduction, were in full keeping with his attainments and fame—Mr. Alger says, “He was not merely a scholar and a philosopher, but likewise a philanthropist and a saint who thoroughly lived the doctrine he taught”—in the second part of this great work admirably treats the relations between reason and faith. Methodists will find no fault, we think, with any of his positions. He is certainly more Arminian than Calvinistic in his doctrine. As a specimen of the beauty of the style we append a single quotation from the closing chapter:

We call the absence of our sun night. But what does the sun show us? It shows us the earth and itself. When it has vanished what do we see? At first we no longer see earth, or sun, or anything. But patience; let night advance, and behold! The stars appear one by one; the entire vault is peopled; the sky is filled with rays, movements, and scintillations, as it were with eyes waking and imploring our gaze. We see the heaven which the sun concealed. So that to anyone who wished to see the whole heaven it was well that the sun went away. But I confess all these stars still seem to you mere drops of luster upon the night. All together do not equal one sunbeam. And yet what have we before our eyes? We have before us the immense universe of suns, in which our own sun is but a point—a point in which the earth is but a fraction. Every imperceptible point of that luminous dust is a sun like ours, surrounded by a hundred living earths as great or greater than our own. Day, therefore, showed us a point; night shows us immensity. May I venture to say that this is one of the divine reasons for the setting of the sun? If the sun reigns and then disappears by turns it is because God desires that, besides the earth, man should also see the heaven. It is precisely the same with the obscurities of faith relatively to the daylight of reason. This is why our dogma teaches that reason, like the sun, should rule and should surrender by turns, should rule over all the earth and surrender in the sight of heaven. Its reign gives it a world; its surrender gives it immensity, in which the world is but a point. Let no one, therefore, be alarmed at the obscurities of faith or the surrenders of the mind.

Religion for the Times. By LUCIEN CLARK, D.D. 12mo, pp. 421. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

When Dr. Clark was in the pastorate he was observed to be so thoughtful and studious in mental disposition and habit, so balanced in intellectual judgment and trained in good taste, so apt and ready in thought, and so fluent, concise, lucid, and graceful in expression that *The Christian Advocate* coveted and secured him for its editorial rooms. While he was engaged in editorial work, going about on Sundays to fill pulpit vacancies in all directions, he was seen to be so rare a prize for any church that the congregations which heard him wondered that the pastorate had ever relinquished a man so conspicuously fitted for it, and began to plot conspiracies for his recapture; knowing which, not many people were surprised when the strong old Madison Avenue Church in Baltimore succeeded in coaxing him away from *The Christian Advocate*. This book is worthy of the editor and of the pastor, and is a product of the outfit of qualities and richness of resources which made both. There is in it the

experienced knowledge of life and of human nature which a faithful pastor gains, the delicate and efficient skill in the application of religious truth to actual and urgent needs which the practiced pastor acquires, and as well the philosophic view, the systematic and orderly thinking, and the careful and accurate statement promoted by literary training. That Dr. Clark should proceed to authorship in book form seems a perfectly natural evolution, whether regarded from the indications of his ministry or his editorship. Beyond the value of any particular book Methodism is indebted to any capable minister or member who incurs the labor and sets the example of really valuable authorship. All stimulus in that direction adds to the dignity and efficiency of the Church. There are a thousand young men in Methodism to-day who ought to be choosing their line of study, selecting particular themes, and beginning the acquisition of materials and drill in composition with an eye to authorship ten or twenty years hence. Specialists are more apt to print than men of general culture, probably from greater confidence in the exactness and topical fullness of their knowledge, as well as from the habit of magnifying the importance of their particular department and emphasizing the specific value of that which they have to publish. Dr. Clark's book is not the work of a specialist. It is a treatment of the great general interests of life in the noblest manner and from a great variety of standpoints, as is indicated in the titles of his twelve chapters: "Christian and Secular Pursuits," "The Best System of Morals," "Culture in its Relation to Christianity," "Debt of Civilization to Christianity," "The Pillar of the State," "The Christian Home," "Light in Darkness," "The Friend of the Poor," "The Fountain of Benevolence," "The Guide and Protector of Youth," "Consolation in Old Age," and "The Conqueror of Death." Recognizing that perfection cannot be claimed for any branch of the Christian Church to-day, that in all creeds there is doubtless some error, and that probably "none have yet fully grasped the true meaning and comprehended the whole system of the great Teacher with perfect accuracy," the author sets forth the sublime sufficiency of Christianity for the solution of all human problems and the meeting of all human needs, and shows how it vindicates its truth and its divine origin by its essential and indispensable relation to all the fundamental interests of humanity and by the real assistance it furnishes to men in the affairs of this life as well as in the preparation for another. And this it does with such cogent reasoning and such impressive and convincing array of undeniable facts as must leave to any rightly constituted mind as little disposition to controvert as there is possibility of doing so successfully. *Religion for the Times* is fresh and pertinent to the living present. There is nothing stale, flat, or unprofitable in it. It is capable of wide usefulness, calculated to help men just where they need it, and certain to afford elevated pleasure and incalculable profit to all who shall read it. We earnestly commend it to homes and to Sabbath schools, to the center tables and the libraries of laity and clergy, confident that no one will regret having purchased it.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Socialism from Genesis to Revelation. By Rev. F. M. SPRAGUE. 12mo, pp. 493. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

The second part of the title of this volume is somewhat misleading. The book is not, as one might expect, a careful inquiry into the attitude of the Bible toward socialism. Indeed, it is not an inquiry at all, but a polemic. What the author probably means to suggest by his title, and what he copiously asserts, is that from Genesis to Revelation the Bible teaches socialism. A book of assertions was not needed to prove this; but the title is only a suggestion, perhaps; for the book probably means to carry the reader's mind along the long journey from the genesis to the revelation of socialism. The author really means that the sacred volume is throughout socialistic in such a sense as the writings of Karl Marx are. In short, the author assumes that our sacred book condemns the private ownership of capital. We should be pleased to read a good argument in favor of that proposition. If it were well done it would be good reading; and that can hardly be said of Mr. Sprague's declamations and assertions. It is a feverish book, neither scientific, logical, nor entertaining. And yet the pretensions of the title and preface put in a claim for consideration. Any respectable attempt to make us more Christian in our industrial life must command our attention. The principle of socialism as defined by Marx, that the States should own the capital employed in production—this is the Christian principle for which our author contends. That it is a Christian principle seems to us the very thing to be proved. The shortest definition of capital is "a tool." It does not seem to us a perfectly clear thing that Christ forbids a gardener to own his spade, a farmer to own his plow, a woodman to own his ax, a fisherman to own his net, or a carpenter to own his plane. Capital includes food for the morrow. It is surely nowhere taught in the Scriptures that an individual may not own a sack of flour or a bushel of potatoes or a fattened calf. Of course, the mind of our author is soaring far above such petty details; but it is only in such small details that the reader of his book can realize to himself what capital really is. Just why a man may lawfully own a spade and yet not be allowed to own an engine or a mill does not appear to us to be revealed in our Bible. Of course a spade, an engine, or a mill is a product of labor; but it does not follow that only muscular effort entered into its production, nor that it ought to be the property of men who did not build it, or even of men who did build it for a contracted equivalent in wages. We cannot shake off the belief that the good man who paid the laborers, every man a penny, was entitled to the grapes. We suspect that he solved his problem in a Christian way when out of his profits on grapes he paid the eleventh-hour men a full day's wages—as our author rightly guesses, paying them on the basis of their needs. But this is philanthropic, not scientific socialism, and the difference is immense. The author, in his use of the parable, gets no farther than the inference that the last-hour men were paid on the basis of their needs, though that

is not in the text; and it does stand in the text that this employer was a capitalist doing as he willed with his own. We suggest, however, that it is not quite a fair use of our Lord's industrial parables to read into them any socialistic theory framed to meet conditions not then existing in the world. A considerable variety of opinions might otherwise gain fictitious support from fanciful readings of these stories as lessons in social modern life. The preface of this book contains statements which make us wonder how a sane man could write it after writing the preface. We are told that "society will no longer tolerate its old dogma respecting private property, freedom of contract, and free competition." The destructive work is then done; why go on slaying the slain? There must be life in these old dogmas; at least our author must believe that society still tolerates them. Mr. Sprague and a good many other people say they no longer tolerate them, but it is very plain that the vast majority of us, including our leaders in economic thought, do tolerate and even preach these dogmas. We take pains at this point to say plainly that the economic and moral conditions of the great concentrated industries are very far from being satisfactory. The book before us seems to be chiefly concerned about the capital and labor employed in such mills. It is well to reflect that the disease is a local one. The vast majority of employers and employed are living in fairly satisfactory conditions. The farms and villages and three fourths of the people in cities know labor questions only as other men's questions. Mainly, then, capital and labor live together in a large measure of harmony. If the disease is local why not study how to cure the unhealthy spot? We are not going to have a national revolution because there is a street brawl in some factory town. It cannot be necessary to upset the farm and the village to restore order in a mill. The point is a seriously important one. Not more than one in forty of our people, perhaps not more than one in a hundred, have any concern in labor and capital troubles. We are strongly persuaded that the schemes our author calls palliatives—such as arbitration and profit-sharing—are steps on the right road, first steps only, but wise ones because they treat the real evil and not some imaginary one. The most suggestive parts of this book are those in which in one form or another the author deprecates inquiry into the effect of the state ownership of capital. He wants us to first accept the principle, as a righteous one, and go to work to adjust our lives to it. We cannot find in the book a particle of proof that the principle is a righteous one. We discover no difference between owning the clothes we wear and the food we are about to eat, on the one hand, and owning a farm, a vine, or a mill, so far as righteousness is concerned. The only way to demonstrate that the wise thing is to abolish private ownership of capital is to consider the effects which would be likely to follow and show that beyond doubt these effects would be salutary. We shall not enter upon a revolution through mere confidence in an untried dogma; we must know how the new proceedings would affect human life. The expression, "The vicious principle of self-interest," is not an argument; it is simply a phrase. It assumes that self-interest is unsocial,

immoral, and unchristian. But nothing is clearer than that Christianity appeals to this principle; and the author of this book must know that in so far as labor advocates adopt socialism they do so on the principle of self-interest. He has doubtless published his book on the vicious principle of self-interest. That any given thing promotes some one's interests is in its favor until it is shown that some other person's interests are damaged. Marx undertook to prove that profits are made at the expense of laborers. The argument will not be repeated by any one capable of understanding Mr. Gunton and others who have exposed the fallacy. The book before us contains the usual boasts of the higher morality of socialism. It develops and appeals to higher motives than salary and wage. This is merely a boast. In fact, socialism rests on a principle of covetousness. It would not have any life if it did not hold out to some men the delusive hope of obtaining the property of other men. Fine words do not disguise the thirst for the contents of other men's cisterns. Ninety per cent of its adherents would fall off if they did not see in it a way to evade the commandment, Thou shalt not steal. These are strong words, but it is time to utter them. The good purpose of a few unwise dreamers must not always cloak the wolf in the hearts of the mass of socialists. Not even a minister of the Gospel can be allowed to misrepresent, unchallenged, the character of the army he is marching with. The word socialism is, unfortunately, still used indefinitely. The book we have before us treats of that kind of socialism which teaches that the public (the State) should own the capital employed in production. Every Christian is a socialist in a very different sense; he believes that he himself owes himself and all his belongings to his fellow-men, and that it is his right, not the right of society, to determine with autocratic authority how he shall perform this duty of self-surrender. The dignity of Christian manhood requires the power to get that one may give. Our socialism is defined practically by John Wesley: "Get all you can; save all you can; give all you can." We cannot lay down this book without expressing our conviction that the scientific socialists have stumbled into absurdity over their dogma, "Labor produces everything," by assuming that labor means muscular effort and that only. There are two producers—muscular effort and intelligence, which devises and directs. The second does most of the labor. Ability is the chief producer of wealth. This master workman of the modern world uses both labor and capital; and without him both would be helpless.

Laws of the Soul; or, The Science of Religion and the Future Life. By M. W. GIFFORD, Ph.D., Author of *Baptism in a Nutshell*, etc. 12mo, pp. 204. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

The study of the soul life, when discussed in such a volume as the one now under review, is among the most dignified of all pursuits. Able in its essence and its activities the superiority of soul to matter must be confessed. Matter is inherently lifeless and inert; the soul is animate and vigorous. Matter never plans or achieves results; the soul is the agent of varied and great accomplishments. Matter is temporal in its endurance.

the soul, like the whole system of supernaturalism to which it belongs, is eternal. In short, the greatest thing in the universe is the soul. Liberated from the thralldom of the sensuous and earthly, we find it therefore ennobling to rise to those higher planes of meditation where man investigates his own psychological processes and speculates on the unchanging laws of mental operation. Nor are these laws undefined or loose, but the reverse is the case. "There are laws," says Dr. Gifford in his present Introduction, "in connection with man's moral and spiritual nature as eternal as the law of gravity. . . . It has been the aim of the author, in the preparation of this little work, to point out some of those laws of the soul that lie back of religious worship, and to show that our religious experience and the cardinal doctrines of our Christian religion rest, not only on the authority of Scripture, but of science as well." In the prosecution of such a line of inquiry arguments drawn from the Scripture would possess at least the merits of solidity and of antiquity. The Bible bears the stamp of accuracy and age upon its delineations of soul essence and activity. While it never poses as a text-book on psychology, yet it is the masterful volume of the centuries in its analysis of the powers and operations of the human soul. Yet because the appeal has been so often made to the Scripture in support of such great laws as Dr. Gifford considers, he has rather chosen to confine himself "almost entirely to the scientific argument" for his proof. Following this method of treatment, he looks abroad in the spirit of Christian philosophy over the world; gives right prominence to the operations of nature; discovers the failure of atheistic science to account for the origin or the continuance of natural processes; finds in the Creator the Author of all being; and unfolds the rule of obedience to divine law under which all created things exist. The detailed discussion of the seventeen chapters of his volume would be impossible within the present limits; or even a full enumeration of their captions would tend to unnecessary prolixity. Among them, however, we find "The Law of Causation, or God's Relation to the Universe;" "The Law of Utility: Man's Relation to God and Nature;" "The Law of Infallibility of Instinct;" "The Law of Consciousness, or Certainties in Religious Knowledge;" "The Law of Adaptation, or the Philosophy of Happiness in Heaven;" "The Law of Self-Condensation, or the Philosophy of Future Suffering;" "The Law of Equity, or the Necessity of a Future Judgment;" "The Law of Compensation: Differences in Glory;" "The Law of Supply: Christ Alone Meets the Wants of the Human Race;" "The Law of the Selection of the Fittest: the Philosophy of Salvation by Faith;" "The Law of Normalcy: the Philosophy of Unbelief." How satisfactory the manner in which Dr. Gifford has compassed this wide field of inquiry will depend upon the status of the reader. Undoubtedly the unchristian scientist—to whom naught is sacred in his *ignis fatuus* pursuit of "truth"—would tear to shreds and tatters the argumentation of the volume. To the Christian reader, however, the logic is clear and progressive. While the book is sometimes vulnerable in its rhetorical construction, elementary in its treatment, or sermonic in its tone, it must

be excused on the ground that it is designed for popular rather than scientific use. In spirit it is certainly healthy and vigorous, and may be advantageously read as a *résumé* of a vast body of Christian truth.

Let Him First Be a Man. By W. H. VENABLE, LL.D., Author of *The Teacher's Dream*, etc. 12mo, pp. 274. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

This is a schoolmaster's book in the double sense of coming from and being intended largely, though by no means exclusively, for that class of intellectual workers. Thus the thoughtless and mentally indolent will be repelled from it; the better and earnest-minded few will be attracted to it. From professors and instructors have come numerous departmental text-books, and in recent years various treatises on pedagogy. Dr. Venable's volume belongs not to either of these classes. It is broader, and therefore interesting to a larger number of readers. It is made up of "educational essays dealing with the common problems of teaching and learning, and derived from actual experience in school and out of school." Its purpose, as indicated in the first sentence of the Preface, is to "encourage teachers, especially young teachers, and assist that large class of self-helpful students who are seeking guidance in the broad field of general culture." The author modestly says that many of the articles printed in his book might properly be called familiar "talks" rather than essays; but that by no means makes them less readable or less valuable; rather all the more alive, animated, and interesting. Dr. Venable is a man of young and modern spirit, who has learned all that the oldest masters could teach him, and in applying it to present needs and conditions shows us that part of what is best in the improvements of to-day comes by a revival of old methods or by expanding and adapting hints derived from some of the wise ancients. Neglecting no part of man's being, this book regards his body as the "quintessence of dust," and his soul as "infinite in faculties," and concerns itself with the "processes of that nurture and training which fit men to live the best and most useful life." "Let Him First Be a Man" is a title taken from Rousseau's *Essay on Education*, and in its use here sounds the high keynote of a book which is not mediocre, barren, or impotent, but spermiatic in quality, containing much seed-thought. At once ideal and practical, it has power to wake up the mind, feed it, and guide it. Strong and valuable in its original matter, it culls things superior, rich, and exquisite from many fields, with almost Emersonian facility for apt, varied, and beautiful quotation. Some of the poetry is original. That the author is practiced in estimating intellectual and moral values is apparent. Much reading and study of the sifting sort has emptied its sieve into these pages. A wide range of ancient and modern literature is in sight. There is evidence of the painstaking care and precision which might be expected from a lifelong educator, and also of that philanthropic and magnanimous passion for imparting knowledge and for inculcating pure and noble principles without which there is no true instructor and no sufficient inspiration for the exacting, and to some extent thankless, labors of a

teacher's life. No printed page can be contemptible or worthless which offers us the ripe wisdom of studious, reflective, and extended experience, the product of the strenuous endeavors and inquiring search of an earnest and laborious soul, and which is pervaded by a sense of the solemnity, responsibility, dignity, and sublimity of human existence. The scope and character are indicated by the table of contents: I. EDUCATION: End and Means, Foundation and Superstructure; Young America at School; What is a Man? II. THE PARAGON OF ANIMALS. III. FUNCTIONS OF THE PREPARATORY SCHOOL. IV. SCHOOLMASTERY: 1. Guide, Shepherd, and Pilot; 2. What the Schoolmaster Masters; 3. Teaching and Governing; 4. Persuasion and Force; 5. Dr. Arnold's Way; 6. How Not to Govern a School; 7. The True Story of "Rusty Nails;" 8. The Ideal Teacher. V. NATURE THE SOVEREIGN SCHOOLMISTRESS. VI. TOPICS OF THE TIME: 1. "Experiments of Light;" 2. Both Sides are Right; 3. Disco; 4. Natural Ability plus Education; 5. The Quick Coal; 6. Does it Educate? 7. The Beginnings of Education; 8. Education and Temperance; 9. Universal Education. VII. BOOKS AND READING. VIII. UNCLASSIFIED TRIFLES: 1. Stray Thoughts; 2. Woman's Rights; 3. Past, Present, and Future; 4. Progress of Civilization; 5. Use of the Ideal; 6. Combinations *versus* Individuals; 7. A Collection of Men; 8. Education Out of School; 9. The Old-fashioned Elocutionist; 10. "It's Books;" 11. The Cultured Snob; 12. Natural Science Teaching in the Common Schools; 13. How to Say It. IX. STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION: 1. Confucius; 2. Education in Ancient Greece; 3. Plato and Education; 4. Aristotle and Education; 5. Quintilian; 6. Goethe as an Educational Light. X. THE UTILITY OF THE IDEAL. XI. SYLVAN MYTHOLOGY, POETRY, AND SENTIMENT. This makes no pretensions to being a great book; but these talks and essays are full of noble views of human culture good for all who are interested in education for themselves or others, and, finally and best, are by a teacher who has sat at the feet of the great Teacher, looked up with reverence into his face, and listened pondering to the words which are spirit and life.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

The Life and Work of John Ruskin. By W. G. COLLINGWOOD, M.A., Editor of *The Poems of John Ruskin*, etc. With Portraits and other Illustrations. In two volumes. 8vo, pp. 565. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$5.

At the time of the publication of this book Ruskin is peculiarly dear to the English-speaking race as the sole survivor of the literary great men of his generation in the British Isles. It is laid upon our table quietly and makes no great sensation in the market; but in the near future, possibly by the time this notice meets the reader's eye, public interest will be turned to these admirable volumes by an event which the world would gladly postpone were the power of life and death in its hands. There is no Ruskin craze abroad just now. Men of fifty remember the sensation and stir made

by the rising of Ruskin's brilliant star; men of thirty and under have not seen the literary world star-gazing at that bright particular luminary shining now with steady splendor for half a century. Soon the passing of Ruskin to the life immortal will concentrate attention upon his writings and the volumes before us will be in large demand. Few lives now breathing among mortals are so nobly worthy of record, or so full of work high-pitched in quality and purpose and laboriously as well as enthusiastically performed. Centuries hence his name will not be moss-grown. The products of his genius are a lasting treasure, which no study of the literature of the Victorian age can omit to examine or fail to admire. If any student, by reason of a prosaic cast of mind, an unawakened imagination, unfortunate reading or lack of reading, has failed to catch the enthusiasm for literature, having failed to experience the thrill and elation which great thoughts and a splendid style can impart, we earnestly exhort him to yield himself to Ruskin for a while; and, if this master has no spell that can bewitch him, then it will be plain that the Creator has not seen fit to give him lungs to breathe or wings to fly in the air of literature. Scarce any other man has so illuminated and decorated the House of Life for mankind. Mr. Collingwood's eminently satisfactory book confines itself to the limits of its title and accomplishes all it undertakes. A complete collection of Ruskiniana would make large volumes and is properly left until the time shall come for summing up the life now in its seventy-fifth year. What a volume his letters will make when the day arrives for gathering them! Only a few are given in the work before us, and a few from certain friends, notably Carlyle and Browning. When the newspapers were in "ecstasies of rapture" over the appearance of the first volume of *The Stones of Venice* Carlyle wrote: "A strange, unexpected *Sermon* in Stones, most true and excellent, I believe, as well as the best piece of School-mastering in Architectonics; from which I hope to learn in a great many ways. It is a quite new *renaissance* we are getting into just now: either toward new, wider manhood, high again as the eternal stars; or else into final death and the mask of Gehenna for evermore." To this the sage of Chelsea adds, "We are still laboring under the foul kind of influenza here, I not far from emancipated, my poor wife still deep in the business;" from which it appears they had *la grippe* there in 1851. Of the *Ethics of the Dust* Carlyle writes: "A most shining performance! Not for a long while have I read anything a tenth part so radiant with talent, ingenuity, lambent fire (sheet and other lightnings) of all commendable kinds." "In power of expression supreme." "Exquisite with a poetry that might fill any Tennyson with despair." Of the *Queen of the Air* he writes: "No such book have I met with for long years. The one soul now in the world who seems to feel as I do on the highest matters, and speaks *nir aus dem Herzen*, exactly what I wanted to hear! Well done! Pluck up heart and continue. And don't say, 'Most great thoughts are dressed in shrouds;' many, many are the Phæbus Apollo celestial arrows you still have to shoot into the foul Pythons and poisonous, abominable Megatheriums and Plesiosaurians that go staggering about, large

as cathedrals in our sunk epoch." When Letter V, "Fors Clavigera," arrives, Carlyle writes Ruskin: "This, which I have just finished reading, is incomparable; a quasi-sacred consolation to me, which almost brings tears into my eyes! Every word of it is as if spoken out of the eternal skies; words winged with empyrean wisdom, piercing as lightning." Fortunate is the possessor of these volumes. Happy the biographer with such a theme as the life and work of John Ruskin, whose record with rare completeness matches the standard of Dr. Vandyke's lines:

Four things a man must learn to do
 If he would make his record true:
 To think without confusion clearly;
 To love his fellow-men sincerely;
 To act from honest motives purely;
 To trust in God and heaven securely.

The Puritan in Holland, England, and America. An Introduction to American History. In two volumes. By DOUGLAS CAMPBELL, A.M., LL.B., Member of the American Historical Association. 8vo, Vol. I, pp. 509; Vol. II, pp. 588. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$5.

Under no circumstances could the Puritan ever become an unattractive character upon the historic page. A Calvinist in his theological views and a republican in his political sentiments, he so put his impress upon European life, in former centuries, that, were his presence and operations altogether transatlantic, his sturdiness, his high intelligence, his intense religious convictions, and his sacrifices for freedom would make him forever conspicuous as a historic figure. The rise of Puritanism in Holland, to say naught of its influential presence elsewhere, is a distinct and all-important epoch. These Holland Puritans, says Mr. Campbell, "sealed their devotion to the faith by carrying through a war unparalleled in the history of arms and founding a republic which endured for over two centuries." Yet, vigorous as was the growth of this sturdy plant upon the soil of the Netherlands, its drift as an exotic in the rugged climate of the New World gives it additional claim to notice. The Puritanism of America, in other words, was the consummate development of Holland and English Puritanisms, and lifts them into eternal conspicuousness. American history can only be intelligently interpreted by the recognition of Puritanism as an influential force in the early development of the New World. When Mr. Campbell, as a law student, more than a quarter of a century since, began to gather material "for a history of the jurisprudence of colonial New York" he presently found this to be the case. "From their earliest school days," he remarks, "Americans have been told that this nation is a transplanted England and that we must look to the motherland as the home of our institutions. But the men who founded New York were not Englishmen; they were Hollanders, Walloons, and Huguenots. The colony was under Dutch law for half a century; its population was probably not half English even at the time of the Revolution; and yet here one finds some of the institutions which give America its distinctive character, while, what is more remarkable, no trace of many of these

same institutions can be found in England. What was their origin became to me an interesting question. New York, which was first settled, certainly did not derive them from New England, and New England probably did not derive them from New York. Could there have been a common fountain which fed both these streams, the debt to which has never been acknowledged? Of course the Netherlands Republic must have been this fountain, if one existed; but to prove its existence and the mode in which its influence was exerted on New England required an examination far outside the record of New York." In this somewhat lengthy quotation from Mr. Campbell's Introduction is, therefore, contained the gist of the theory which he came in former days to adopt, and the key to the voluminous work now under consideration. Two visits were made by him to Holland for the examination of early records there preserved; and as a result of such opportunities for investigation, as well as of years of meditation, these volumes were finally the outcome. It would be a practically impossible undertaking to linger in minute comment on the near eleven hundred pages which he has written. Some of his chapters are entitled, "The Netherlands Before the War with Spain," "Revolution in the Netherlands," "England Before Elizabeth," "Elizabethan England," "English Puritanism," "The English in the Netherlands—1585-88," "The Invincible Armada," "England After the Armada," "King James and the Puritans," "The Netherlands Republic," "The Netherlands Republic and the United States," and "The Scotch-Irish, the Puritans of the South." From such an enumeration it will easily be seen how wide is the field Mr. Campbell has traversed, how painstaking must have been his preparation, and what a thesaurus of historical information he has presumably given to the reading world. Luminous in his method of narration and apparently fair in his use of historic incident, his zeal in the elucidation of his theory never lags until the end. That he is over-enthusiastic in pressing his claim for the influence of Puritanism upon modern life some may hold; yet no more valuable treatise, we are persuaded, on the personality and influence of the Puritan has in late years appeared. It is a matter of regret, from the earthly standpoint, that Mr. Campbell has not lived to enjoy his well-earned laurels.

Froebel Letters. Edited, with Explanatory Notes and Additional Matter, by ARNOLD H. HEINEMANN. 12mo, pp. 182. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

The immortality of Friedrich Froebel is assured. While some men come to fame through the inventor's skill, the explorer's discovery of new continents, or the warrior's cruel sword, in the more quiet and unobtrusive department of child training has the hero of the present volume achieved his enduring renown. Yet he was not led on in his pursuits from any selfish love of fame, which too often induces men to barter away their nobler manhood. In a spirit of sacrifice which led him to forget himself in the interests of childhood he wrought for the improvement of the educational processes of his day and has won that repute which Chris-

tian humanitarianism often brings. As a man the reader will not fail to admire him. His guilelessness, his industry, his conscientiousness, and his tender sympathy make him in no small measure an example for imitation. But the volume traces the development of the Kindergarten system, as well as presents a biography of Froebel himself; and the fact that it is in part made up of his own letters, now for the first time published, makes the book an authoritative record of the growth of Froebel's system. Like many other helpful theories, the Kindergarten method was an evolution. The origin of the name itself and the conception of various devices, like the use of sand in teaching, are illustrations of what these Froebel letters contain. One cannot read the book without thankfulness that such a man has lived, without appreciation of the services of Frau Luise Froebel in the development of the Kindergarten movement, and without a new realization of the scientific value of the system.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Cry from the Depths; or, The Mourner Comforted. By REV. E. T. CURNICK, A.M. Pamphlet, pp. 31. Boston: Charles R. Magee. Price, paper, 10 cents.

This is an attempt to expound the meaning and use of suffering and to apply the balm of Gilead to the wounds of the world. With the second beatitude as a text the author uses reason and Scripture to instruct and console, in an order of thought which is best indicated by the table of contents:

I. INTRODUCTION.

- II. MINISTRY OF SUFFERING.—1. Pain a Protest against Physical Excess.
2. Danger Signals before the Mind. 3. Warnings against Business Excitement.
4. Man's Frailty shown by Suffering. 5. Pain a Factor in the World's Advance.

III. MOURNING FOR SIN.—1. Soul Conscious of its True State. 2. Sin Hated and Forsaken.

- IV. "THOU COMFORTEST ME."—1. In Christ the Mourner is Justified. 2. He is Born from Above. 3. His Eternal Felicity.

Report of the Master and Examiner in the Reading Equity Case of Kreeker vs. Shirey, with the Opinion of the Court of Common Pleas of Berks County, Pa., Sustaining the Same. Pamphlet. Philadelphia: Collins Printing House. Sold by Rev. J. H. Shirey, Reading, Pa. Price, paper, 50 cents.

This is the official copy of the judgment of the civil court upon the question whether Rev. Augustus Kreeker or Rev. Jonas H. Shirey is entitled by law to the pastorate of "Immanuel Church of the Evangelical Association" in the city of Reading, Pa. It is a thorough and comprehensive review of the Evangelical Association controversy from a legal standpoint; a clear and able vindication of the principles contended for by those in whose favor the court is constrained by law and equity to render its verdict. Seldom has a civil tribunal bestowed greater pains to make exhaustive examination or exhibited finer power of comprehension and of lucid argument in matters ecclesiastical. It is a model document and of no little historical value, bearing not only on the particular point decided

by it, but also on numerous other points of wider interest involved therewith or thereto related.

The Golden City. A Sermon by W. V. TUDOR, D.D., Pastor of Broad Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Richmond, Va. Pamphlet, pp. 16. Richmond: J. W. Fergusson & Son.

This is a discourse on heaven which seems pitched on the key of Bernard of Cluny's sweet, blessed, and rapturous hymn, "Jerusalem the Golden." It is a good specimen of that fervid, glittering, and sumptuous eloquence of which the South, in pulpit and on platform, has been prolific; which the North seldom produces, but is able to enjoy and admire. The author is a well-known and popular minister of our sister Church, only a trifle nearer the tropics than we are.

Walter and Nellie, or the Shadow of the Rock. Five Illustrations. By Mrs. S. S. ROBBINS. 16mo, pp. 293. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

The Little Sea Bird. Five Illustrations. By Mrs. S. S. ROBBINS. 16mo, pp. 170. Price, cloth, 40 cents.

Daisy Downs, or What the Sabbath School Can Do. Four Illustrations. By Mrs. S. S. ROBBINS. 16mo, pp. 306. Price, cloth, 55 cents.

Kitty's Dream, and Other Stories. Seven Illustrations. By Mrs. S. S. ROBBINS. 16mo, pp. 212. Price, cloth, 45 cents.

The above from the ready pen of a single author are interesting and instructive Sunday school stories for juvenile readers. The children will enjoy these narratives. They are among the latest issued by the eastern Book Concern.

Men and Morals. By the Rev. JAMES STALKER, D.D., Author of *The Life of Jesus Christ*, etc. 16mo, pp. 178. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

Eight discourses, delivered to the students of Mr. Moody's school at Northfield, in the chapel of Yale University, and elsewhere, make up the above volume. It is enough to say of these addresses that they are vigorous, practical, and helpful. Dr. Stalker is no less at his best in this incidental publication than in more pretentious volumes.

The March of Methodism from Epworth Around the Globe. Outlines of the History, Doctrine, and Polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By JAMES MCGEE. With an Introduction by Bishop JAMES N. FITZGERALD, LL.D., President of the Epworth League. 12mo, pp. 147. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

To condense the story of so magnificent a religious movement as that of Methodism within so small a compass as the present outlines is no easy undertaking. Yet this is the task Mr. McGee has undertaken, and we would judge, with some fair degree of success. While condensation necessarily means the omission of much that is valuable in biography and incident, yet the author would seem to have preserved the links which are indispensable in the chain of denominational history, and what he has written he has written with such general excellence and clearness of arrangement as to make his handbook one of practical service, particularly to the Epworth Leaguers of the Church.

C. L. S. C. BOOKS



And Required Literature



For the New Year,

OCTOBER, 1893-94.

Rome and the Making of Modern Europe, by JAMES R. JOY, A.M. 12mo. \$1.

Mr. Joy has prepared an admirably condensed and yet lucid outline of Roman history, which is carried on through the Middle Ages in a way that shows very clearly how the foundations of modern European states were laid. This volume is not only intrinsically interesting, but it also presents facts and traces movements a knowledge of which is essential to a thorough understanding of nineteenth century history.

Roman and Medieval Art (with 149 illustrations), by Prof. W. H. GOODYEAR. 12mo. \$1.

There is no more captivating study than that of the origin and development of the æsthetic faculties and their expression in art and architecture. In this volume Professor Goodyear, whose style is delightfully simple and readable, has traced the evolution of Greek art through Roman history into the Middle Ages. The text is richly illustrated with pictures of famous art treasures.

Outlines of Economics, by Dr. RICHARD T. ELY. 12mo. \$1.

This is a radical revision of Dr. Ely's "Introduction to Political Economy," which has been so highly commended in all quarters. "The Dismal Science" under the author's skillful, sympathetic treatment becomes a most interesting study of the everyday conditions of life, which gain new significance. It is impossible to lay too much stress upon the importance of a more widely diffused and accurate knowledge of the economic and social principles so clearly set forth in this book.

Classic Latin Course in English, by Prof. W. C. WILKINSON. 12mo. \$1.

Dr. Wilkinson has condensed his two volumes into one of 300 pages, retaining all the choicest passages from those authors whose influence has been felt through all the centuries down to these modern times. This book is admirably suited to give the general reader an acquaintance with the character and material of the Latin classics.

Song and Legend from the Middle Ages, edited by Prof. W. D. MCCLINTOCK and PORTER L. MCCLINTOCK. 12mo. 50 cents.

This is a delightful little book of poems and stories translated from French, Spanish, Italian, German, and Scandinavian originals. The Arthurian legends, the ballads of the Cid, choice passages from Dante, and other portions of mediæval literature make up a unique and charming volume.

Science and Prayer, by Dr. W. W. KINSLEY. 12mo. 50 cents.

This is a discussion of the alleged inconsistency between the scientific conception of natural law and the doctrine of divine interposition. The treatment is judicial and clear, and the book cannot fail to be read with interest by all.

The Chautauquan (12 numbers, illustrated. \$2.)

One order and \$7 will secure all the Required Literature
for the Year 1893-94.

On all orders of five or more sets of books sent to the same address by
express (charges unpaid) a discount of ten per cent will be allowed.

The C. L. S. C. Books are uniform in height and width,
varying only in thickness.

HUNT & EATON, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.

CRANSTON & CURTS, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis.

Thirty-five Million Dollars Saved

By reducing the premium rates charged to members to harmonize with the payments to the widows and orphans for death claims, more than Thirty-five Million Dollars have already been saved to the members of the

MUTUAL

RESERVE

FUND

LIFE

ASSOCIATION

Record and Financial Standing:

Membership, over	70,000
Interest Income annually exceeds	\$127,000.00
Bimonthly Income exceeds	\$600,000.00
Reserve Fund, May 15, 1893, ...	\$3,449,326.13
Total Assets, ...	\$4,785,286.00
Death Claims Paid, over \$15,700,000.00	
New Business in 1892, ...	over \$60,000,000.00
Insurance in Force	exceeds \$250,000,000.00

Why Pay \$100

per year for your Life Insurance when the same amount of Insurance can be had in one of the strongest Life Insurance Companies in the World

for \$50?

THE
MUTUAL RESERVE FUND
LIFE ASSOCIATION

} Furnishes Life Insurance at
about one half the usual rates
charged by the Old-System Com-

panies. It has excellent positions to offer in its Agency Department in every City, Town, and State, to Experienced and Successful Business Men.

Parties desiring Insurance will be furnished free information at the Home Office, or by any of the Association's General Agents.

Home Office is "Potter Building," 38 Park Row, N. Y.

E. B. HARPER, President.

O. D. BALDWIN, Vice President.
HENRY J. REINMUND, Second Vice President, *Ex-Supt. Ins. Dept., Ohio.*
J. D. WELLS, Third Vice President.
F. A. BURNHAM, Counsel.
F. T. BRAMAN, Secretary.
JOHN W. VROOMAN, Treasurer.

J. W. BOWDEN, M.D., Medical Director.
G. R. MCCLESNEY, Comptroller.
J. L. SLAMAN, M.D., Medical Supervisor.
Hon. J. J. GORMAN, Director.
GEO. H. WOOSTER, "
CHAS. W. JACKSON, "
CENTRAL TRUST COMPANY, Trustee.

METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, D.D., Editor.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. SOME POPULAR MISTAKES RESPECTING EVOLUTION. <i>Professor B. P. Bourne, Boston University, Boston, Mass.</i>	849
II. MATTHEW ARNOLD. <i>Professor A. B. Hyde, Denver University, Denver, Colo.</i>	867
III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND LAW OF MARRIAGE. <i>Rev. C. C. Starbuck, Andover, Mass.</i>	878
IV. SOME ASPECTS OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY. <i>Charles W. Super, President Ohio University, Athens, O.</i>	896
V. SOME CONDITIONS OF STYLE. <i>D. H. Wheeler, LL.D., Chicago, Ill.</i>	910
VI. THE COMING HERO. <i>A. A. Johnson, President Wyoming University, Laramie, Wyo.</i>	915
VII. THE PAULINE EPISTLES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—PART II. <i>Mrs. C. T. Mead, Hartford, Conn.</i>	924
EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS:	
OPINION.	938
CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.	948
The Dissensions in the Evangelical Association of North America, 949; Truth and Falsehood in Railroad and Other Affairs, 954.	
PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.	961
THE ARENA.	964
Methodism as Affected by Recent Biblical Criticism, 964; Dr. Strong's Positions Maintained, 965; A Hint to Methodist Journalistic Enterprise, 966; What Light Have the Heathen? 967; Prescience of Future Contingencies, 968.	
THE ITINERANTS' CLUB	969
The Ministerial Student—Going to College, 969; The Study of Originals, 970; "Almost," or "With But Little" (Continued), 971; Studies for the Quadrennium (Continued), 973.	
FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ	975
Some Leaders of Thought, 975; Recent Theological Literature, 977; Religious and Educational, 979.	
EDITORIAL REVIEWS:	
SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES	983
BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES	989
INDEX.	1002

NEW YORK:
 HUNT & EATON.
 CINCINNATI:

CRANSTON & CURTS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, POSTAGE INCLUDED, \$2.50.

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]

PULPIT AND PLATFORM

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES

By O. H. TIFFANY, D.D., LL.D.

COMPILED BY J. WESLEY JOHNSTON, D.D.

"These sermons and addresses have been gathered from the large accumulations of a brilliant and useful ministerial career. They are worthy of the man, of his Church, of his many friends, and of a place on the table of all laymen and preachers. They who read will say: 'Why is the volume not double its present size?' But no volume can convey the charm of the preacher's wonderful presence or superb manner. Yet this does bear to us on every page the clear proof of the tropical splendor of his genius, the breadth of his great heart, and the real depth of his spiritual life."—BISHOP JOHN F. HURST.

"The late Dr. Tiffany was one of the foremost preachers in this generation in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Indeed, he may be reckoned among the best of American pulpit orators. Such a volume as this, especially to those who knew the man personally, will be an inspiration and a help. We feel quite sure that most Methodist preachers and many Methodist laymen will wish to have it."—*Zion's Herald*.

"The late Dr. O. H. Tiffany possessed exceptional gifts of expression and an almost peerless elocution, while the matter of his discourses was thoughtful and stimulating, abounding in felicitous illustration and apt quotation. The discourses and addresses selected for publication admirably represent his powers."—*Northwestern Christian Advocate*.

"The discourses in this work reveal the author's power of analysis, his keen insight into the meaning of the Word, and his skill in dividing the truth so as to make his hearers see its meaning and feel its power. As we read these utterances we rejoice to see how everything is subordinated to the exaltation of the Christ and the great ends of a true Christian ministry."—*New York Observer*.

"The sermons and addresses contained in this volume are masterpieces of this genre of the Methodist pulpit."—*Baltimore Methodist*.

"An excellent selection from the sermons and addresses of this grand preacher, showing the many-sidedness of his talent and the source of his power. Able and suggestive, these sermons will be timely and as much to the point a hundred years hence as now."—*Buffalo Christian Advocate*.

"The sermons and addresses here collected are impressive and suggestive, and they do what sermons are not always sure to do, throw light on the passage in question. The thoughts are, in general, simple, not complex, practical in the proper sense of the word, both explaining duty and moving to its practice; while they are by no means narrowed down to the limited horizon of the average hearer, they are not expanded beyond his power to follow. What Dr. Tiffany has to say on the duty of critically studying the Bible, on Christ's method of treating honest doubt, on 'the things which are Caesar's,' are good illustrations of the method of simplicity in dealing with vexed questions. The sermon on the Silence of Christ is perhaps the best example of that richness of diction for which Dr. Tiffany was celebrated."—*New York Evangelist*.

"Dr. Tiffany was known to the Church as a cultured and masterly preacher. It is now that a few of his sermons and addresses are to be preserved in this form. They are all in the doctor's polished and impressive style, and will be read with great pleasure."—*Pittsburg Christian Advocate*.

Crown Octavo, Portrait of Dr. Tiffany, Cloth, \$1.25.

HUNT & EATON, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.
CRANSTON & CURTS, Cincinnati, O.

METHODIST REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1893.

ART. I.—SOME POPULAR MISTAKES RESPECTING EVOLUTION.

IN the last number of the *Review* evolution was treated of as a general cosmic formula; and it was pointed out that the mistakes of popular thought upon the subject are mainly due to a confusion of the supposed fact of evolution with sundry doubtful metaphysical interpretations. We shall find the same thing to be true of organic evolution. In the organic world evolution is no longer a cosmic formula but a biological doctrine. By a little verbal conjuring it may indeed be made to appear as an illustration of the cosmic theory, but no new insight or evidence is gained thereby. Sawing wood, trimming one's beard, sifting ashes, and weeding the garden may all be brought under a common rubric; yet after all it is hardly worth while to announce that these diverse operations are but phases of the one fundamental process of differentiation. In the organic field evolution is simply the claim that existing living forms can be traced back along genealogical lines to a common starting point in some very simple primitive forms. This does not mean that existing forms can be changed into one another, but rather that they have grown out of a common origin, just as the branches of a tree, though separate and individual, unite in a common trunk and develop by a common process of the formation and growth of terminal and lateral buds. The essential idea is that of genetic connection. Present forms have arisen out of past forms along lines of descent; but when the forms have arisen there may be in many cases no further communication possible.

A complete discussion of this subject would need to consider three distinct points: (1) the fact of organic evolution; (2) the explanation of organic forms by means of evolution; and (3) the metaphysical cause or causes which underlie evolution. It is only as these are kept distinct that we can hope for any assured outcome. If genetic connection is not a fact the theory fails in its foundation. If it be a fact, but we are unable to connect it by any definite laws with the origin and differentiation of organic forms, we are no better off than before. If both of these points are sufficiently cleared up we need for our final peace some conception of the agent or agents which are carrying on the process.

On the first point we find very general agreement in spite of many outstanding difficulties, some of which are of a fundamental nature. The final result with minds of a judicial and critical type will probably be a somewhat more agnostic attitude than obtains at present. On the second point students are all at sea. There is no generally accepted theory of evolution. Natural selection, which for a time seemed to be the key for the unlocking of all mysteries, has been remanded to a subordinate position, and many evolutionists have ventured to speak slightly of it. The action of the environment, use and disuse of organs, physiological variations, extraordinary births, and mysterious variations in the reproductive functions are all appealed to to explain the origin of species; and however successful they may be with particular cases, they are each and all sadly lacking when put alongside of the problem as a whole. The theory of evolution, then, is far from settled; and the agreement of students on the fact of evolution should not blind us to their disagreement on the theory. On the third point, the metaphysics of the process, we find generally only the crude, unconscious dogmatism of the senses. The failure to keep the several questions distinct has filled the discussion with confusion. Gradually, however, we are learning to distinguish them and are getting beyond some of the wild work of years ago. Surmises about what took place in "Lemuria," or about the missing links that may yet be found on the ocean's bed are given less and less weight as arguments.

But our aim is not to discuss the truth of evolution, but rather to criticise some mistaken inferences from it which

abound in popular thought. It is clear to everyone with only slight critical power that the supposed fact and the inferences from it have been sadly mixed. The inference most commonly drawn is that men are apes, or tadpoles, or some other animal which may strike us as rhetorically effective. There seems to be in many minds both spherical and chromatic aberration, which forbid them to see facts in sharp definition and without distorting haze; and certainly there is no more striking illustration than the subject in question presents. For, granting the fact of evolution, the truth would be simply that individuals taken from mutually remote points in a genealogical series would be so unlike as to forbid classifying them together. There would not be a change of individuals into something else, but a succession of unlike individuals along lines of descent. This would exhaust the fact; and it would leave entirely open the question concerning (1) the nature of the individual, and (2) the nature of the power which produces individuals. But popular thought, supposing that genetic connection must imply some identical essence, concludes that the earlier and the later members of the series are the same; and, as the earlier members were possibly arboreal or amphibious in their habits, there is nothing for it but to identify the later members with their ancestors.

In the same way the transformation of species is commonly misunderstood. In logic a species is any group of individuals which have some element of similarity. Most logical species are confessedly artificial and are imposed upon things by the mind for its own convenience. The things themselves are as indifferent to the classification as the earth is indifferent to the parallels of latitude of the geographer, or as time is to our dates and anniversaries. It is absolutely nothing to the temporal flow that we call one part of it June. It is contended, however, that natural species exist objectively; yet even here the most decided realist must allow that most species are of our own making. Dr. Asa Gray said that he had made and unmade too many species to believe in their fixity; and everyone knows how the classification of low forms of life changes from year to year. The realistic contention has plausibility only when applied to the more striking and highly differentiated forms of life. Now the evolutionist who understands himself is a thoroughgoing

nominalist. For him a species is only a group of more or less similar individuals, and apart from these it is nothing. Hence, for him the transformation of a species could only mean the production along genealogical lines of dissimilar individuals, thus forming a new group. These groups, again, would be only relatively fixed, and might shade away at their edges into other groups, so that no fixed frontier could be discovered. But popular thought is always realistic. Its notion of transformation rests on the fancy that a species is a real essence apart from the individual; and the notion that the later individuals are really the same as the earlier rests on an implicit denial of the transformation. Hence, although transformed, it is really the same old thing after all; that is, there has been no real transformation. In short, popular thought overlooks the nominalism of the doctrine of descent and seeks to interpret it by the traditional realism. Thus it digs a ditch for itself and then falls into it.

In all this the illusion is patent. Species are no substantial essences; and generation in any of its forms is only a name for a process whose inner nature and causes are wrapped in mystery. It is the process by which living individuals originate. We know some of the phenomenal conditions, and in this inductive sense we know something of the causes; but what the real agent is which produces individuals lies beyond any ken of ours. And when produced in this way they are as distinct and separate as if produced directly from raw material or made out of hand. Our knowledge of the process is purely empirical and phenomenal. Why such a process exists at all or why its successive phases follow in their discovered order is something we cannot fathom. Any other order is conceivably quite as possible. Here, as in the cosmos as a whole, we find an order of procedure, but are ignorant of the forces at work and of their laws.

If, then, in tracing the history of organic forms along genealogical lines we find a growing complexity and a continued process, the simple fact would be that the power which produces individuals, instead of producing them all on a level, would rather produce them on a varied and rising scale, a scale of greater complexity and heterogeneity and one of growing adaptation to larger and fuller life. There is nothing whatever in the fact of such connection which identifies individuals, or which identifies higher and lower forms. It only says that the

higher forms have been brought into existence along lines of descent, and not directly from inorganic raw material. They are lateral buds higher up on the tree of life, rather than isolated beginnings. But when the higher forms are produced they are what they are, and are not to be confounded with their antecedents. We may indeed class them together for logical convenience, and may speak of later forms as modifications of earlier ones; but both the identification and the modification are purely subjective, and have no significance for the real things. Apart from our subjective manipulation, the fact is the individuals and the power which produces individuals through the processes of generation in such a way that they admit of being classified according to an ascending scale. All else is the shadow of our own minds.

Such would be the fact. And it is further plain that there is nothing in this fact in any way incompatible with the belief that the growing complexity of organic forms represents a plan and purpose. For if we suppose God to have created a world in time no one can say that he may not have brought forward its factors successively as well as simultaneously, and that he may not have made the earlier stages the conditions of the later. The question of plan must not be confounded with the question of method. Whether there is any plan can be decided only by studying the product. If the organic world has attained a stage in which such a plan is manifest the reality of the plan cannot be discredited by reciting the method of its realization. Such difficulty as popular thought finds here arises from three causes—its tacit realism, its underlying mechanical philosophy, and the psychological difficulty in seeing purpose when it is slowly realized. The first leads us to fancy that descent and classification identify the first and the last, and thus reduce us to apes. The second misleads us into making nature into a self-executing material system, which is able to begin with nothing and on its own account blindly produce all things. The third cause leads us to overlook the relativity of all time estimates and to demand that cosmic purpose shall be measured, not by universal harmony and adaptation, but by the rate of our mental movement. But if the present order of living things would point to intelligence if instantaneously produced, it points equally to intelligence however produced. This results from that complete determina-

tion of everything in a mechanical system which makes it impossible for anything to emerge in such a system which has not always been implicit in it. Every survival and non-survival and the net result of all survivals and non-survivals have been predetermined either from the beginning or from everlasting.

From oversight of this fact a peculiar abstraction is apt to mislead us here. Thus we separate the organic world from the inorganic and tend to make the latter the reality of which the former is a passing product. But we get such a notion only from the unlawful abstractions of verbal thinking. The reality is neither the inorganic alone nor the organic alone, but the actual universe, of which both the organic and the inorganic are manifestations. If it be said that the inorganic certainly preceded the organic, that shows not that the inorganic produces the inorganic, but rather and only that the inorganic manifestation of reality preceded the organic manifestation. When this is seen we are freed from those sterile and verbal debates about the origin of life from the essentially inorganic.

Popular thought has been further misled by sundry phrases and figures of speech which have figured prominently in the discussion. The implicit anthropomorphism in the phrase "natural selection," and the ambiguity in the phrase "the survival of the fittest," have often lent an unreal cogency to evolutionary reasoning. By force of the phrases alone provision is made for selection and progress. It only remains to call the phrases laws to reach a complete insight into the mysteries of organic forms. This is pathetic. Selection is an anthropomorphic metaphor. The fact is simply that organisms unadapted or ill adapted to the conditions of their existence perish, while others better adapted survive. It presupposes the existence of organisms, the general laws of life, the processes of generation, and then explains to us, not how adapted forms arise and survive, but how unadapted forms perish. The non-survival of the unfit, in the sense of unadapted to the conditions of existence, is plain enough, but the existence of the fit is not explained thereby. The fact that weak boilers blow up contains no account of the existence of boilers in general and of strong boilers in particular. When the metaphor is eliminated from the doctrine we see that the knot of the problem lies not in the survival, but in

the arrival of adapted forms; and for this natural selection makes no provision, but takes it for granted.

The ambiguity in "the survival of the fittest" is manifest. The doctrine is a barren tautology, if we determine fitness by survival; and, in a qualitative sense, it constitutes a problem rather than a solution. That the system of things should be such as to favor the fittest, in the sense of the highest, would be a noteworthy circumstance. In itself the doctrine is as compatible with regress as with progress. Which it shall be depends altogether upon the conditions external and internal; and when these work together to secure a real qualitative progress we need something more than the survival of the fittest to account for the fact. And when the fittest arrive and survive in such a way as to fall into different kinds and groups we have a result for the expression of which the old doctrine of types with a little furbishing and some increase of pliability would serve about as well as any. A theist would hardly claim that the Creator produces the similarities which underlie classification without thought of the fact; and an atheist must hold that from all eternity matter has been under the necessity of running in certain molds rather than in any others.

These considerations convince us that the doctrine of descent is entirely harmless so far as theism is concerned. It has, indeed, often been used as the conclusive demonstration of atheism; but this was due entirely to bad logic, crude metaphysics, and fictitious science. In fact, it is very possible that when the theory of descent is thought out into all its implications it will prove to be the most teleological, if not the most anthropomorphic, biological doctrine ever advanced. In many expositions it has already run into teleological conceptions of a mythological type. The same considerations also serve to raise a doubt as to the degree of light which the doctrine throws upon fundamental biological problems. To be sure, the doctrine is said to be accepted by all investigators who are not too old to change their opinions. "All those under forty years of age" was the formula years ago. If none of these have backslidden there must now be practical unanimity. But when we come to apply the doctrine to the solution of biological problems we have less light than we had been led to expect. Certain facts can indeed be connected with certain other facts according to rules em-

pirically discovered; but of the system of facts as a whole and of its general direction we get no account.

We have just seen what a truism the survival of the fittest turns out to be, and how its operation and direction are conditioned by backlying causes which are the real mystery. When, further, the doctrine of descent is held to explain the possibility of classification, the homologies of animal structure, etc., it does it only by assuming the explanation in some so-called law. Genealogical connection alone implies nothing as to its products. These might be like or unlike, for all we know, in any degree whatever. It is only as filiation is restricted to certain results by certain laws, discovered or assumed, that we can deduce anything from it. For the most part we follow Mephistopheles's advice and stick to words. If the offspring is like the ancestor, it is heredity; if unlike, it is differentiation, or variation. Both are names for empirically discovered facts, and neither is a law from which anything specific can be deduced. Either "law," taken absolutely, contradicts the other. In general we have heredity, that is, likeness, enough to explain the likeness, and variation, that is, unlikeness, enough to explain the unlikeness.

Our "laws" have so little definite meaning that, like a dough face, they can be punched into any desirable shape. Under the form of atavism and reversion heredity is easily induced to skip whole generations; and variation may be furnished with any desired velocity and measure. When indefinite time was at our disposal speculators made nothing of using hundreds of millions of years to effect very slight changes. The practical stability of most forms within the historic period was seen to mean nothing, as that period is a vanishing quantity compared with the æons consumed in the process. But when astronomy and geology and physics cut down the eons to moderate proportions there was only momentary embarrassment. By giving variation a variable coefficient, as was most meet, it was easy to make it fast enough or slow enough to fit into any facts whatever. In short, our laws admit of no deduction from them. They prescribe nothing. They are only abstract expressions of the facts themselves and add nothing to them. We have to wait for the facts to occur; and then we classify them as due to heredity or variation. If the facts had been altogether different

we could classify them with equal insight and satisfaction. Variations have arisen, we know not how, and have been preserved from effacement by crossing with the average individual, we know not how. They have been reproduced in the offspring, we know not how; why in the actual direction and measure so as to produce the actual product is altogether beyond us. But we may be sure that if these variations and reproductions fell out as they did the actual order is fully explained. One must be considerably "under forty years of age" to be fully contented with this account.

This logical pliability is well illustrated by the replies to an objection which was made at an early date in the evolution discussion. It was pointed out that cross breeding must speedily efface variations. A variation in a single individual, under the law of heredity and supposing cross fertility, must quickly vanish in the common characteristics. This was a grave objection, and one fatal to the doctrine in its original form. But why may not similar variations have occurred simultaneously in many individuals, at least in a pair? And since animals wander about, why may we not suppose this pair or these similar individuals to have emigrated or been segregated by the upheaval of mountain chains or by the subsidence of the earth's crust so as to form islands, thus escaping cross breeding? Or may not cross fertility itself have ceased through some undemonstrable changes in the reproductive powers of certain individuals, which thereby became a group by themselves? These suggestions, all of which have been gravely made in the history of the debate, show a notable flexibility in the theory and some power of scientific imagination.

The genetic connection of organic forms, then, may well be a fact, and one which enables us to relate many facts in a common scheme; but when we seek to find an essential explanation of organic forms in it we find that the doctrine does not touch bottom. We can carry many things into it, but we can get nothing out of it. In this respect it is like a logical classification which applies to all the particulars included under it, but implies none of them. Of course this is well understood among scientific men themselves; but it is not understood among magazine and hearsay scientists, who, unfortunately, are always with us.

Evolution has also been pursued into the realm of mind with great enthusiasm and greater misunderstanding. It is popularly supposed that evolution has shown that the human mind has been evolved from the brute mind, and hence that there is no essential difference between them. But here again we have to distinguish between the fact and its interpretation. Admitting evolution as true, the fact in the present case would be that minds of a lower grade preceded those of a higher grade, and that if we should classify these minds we should find them constituting an ascending order. There is no mind in general, neither brute nor human. The human mind is only a class term of which the reality is individual human minds. The brute mind also is only a class term; and if there be any reality corresponding to it, it is a multitude of individual minds whose powers are very obscurely known to us. The easy freedom with which we are recommended to study the human mind in its origin in the brute mind would naturally lead one to think that we have an independent and unquestionable knowledge of the brute mind; whereas what little knowledge we have is reached by assimilating the brute's activity to our own, while most of the alleged knowledge is only an inconsistent anthropomorphism. Of course no one ventures consistently to apply the anthropomorphic interpretation; and so we oscillate confusedly between reason and instinct, and lose ourselves in a cloud of words concerning the relations of the human and the brute mind.

Allowing the brute mind, however, the fact that these many minds have appeared in connection with a genealogical series and that they constitute an ascending order is far from deciding the essential nature of the individuals or their relation to one another. To identify them because they are all minds would be like identifying a watch and locomotive because they are both machines, or lead and gold because they are both metals. To identify them because the term mind is one is to overlook the fact that the thing is many and that no classification removes the incommunicable difference of individuality. To class them together because of the assumed genealogical connection would be to assume that the antecedent and consequent must be alike, and that would take all motion out of the doctrine. The actual order, whether intended or not, involves the successive appear-

ance of individual minds so as to form an ascending series in the scale of mentality; but the true nature of the agents by which this series is realized is enveloped in profound obscurity, while the process throws no light on the nature of the individuals themselves. The problem is not, as so many seem to think, to put the abstraction "mind" or the "brute mind" through the various paces of verbal evolution, but to produce a series of individual minds, each distinct from every other and, except in a figurative way, inheriting nothing from any other.

The history of thought furnishes no more striking illustration of the power of the fallacy of the universal than appears in this debate. It is positively pathetic, the way in which men have caught themselves in a verbal trap. To begin with, a deal of rhetorical skirmishing has been done over the general question whether evolution may be applied to man, in which not a little courage of a sort has been shown. The claims of the scientific spirit and of the principle of continuity having been duly vindicated, it only remained to show that the human mind and all its contents admit of being developed from the brute mind as the principle of continuity demands. The method consisted in showing that human faculty and brute faculty differ in degree rather than in kind. Animals love and hate, remember and reason, and even show traces of conscience and religion. Mr. Darwin detected notable indications of a moral nature in dogs; and one French *savant* has discovered in the nightly howling of a dog an act of religious worship. Since, then, the brute mind contains at least the rudiment of our human faculties, it is entirely possible that the latter should have been evolved from the former. This is all the more credible from the fact that the difference between the highest and the lowest man is far greater than that between the highest brute and the lowest man.

Strenuous and agonistic attempts have been made to reply to this by finding in language, in general and abstract ideas, or in the idea of the infinite an impassable gulf between the human and the brute mind. And yet the debate did not touch reality at all; it was only a matter of logical classification or of the contents of a pair of logical abstractions, the human mind and the brute mind. If the two abstractions were found to be identical the concrete problem would be as hard as ever; for this, as we have said, consists not in a verbal shuffling of logical

symbols, but in the production of a series of concrete minds, each of which is a distinct individual and, except in a figurative sense, inherits nothing from any other. Given one or more minds, to produce new minds of higher kind or degree, or indeed of any kind or degree, is the real problem.

The difficulty of this problem is shown in the materialistic debate, and also in the traditional discussion in theology as to the origin of souls. One thing is sure: no one has yet discovered a way for reducing souls to functions of physical organization or for evolving souls from something which is not soul. Equally undiscovered is the way for evolving souls from the souls of parents, say by some process of budding, or fission, or offshoots. The imagination, indeed, readily masters the process by a few sense-images, though more commonly by merely naming the process; but thought finds no escape from viewing each successive mind as a new beginning. Here, as elsewhere, the supposed fact of evolution has been illogically connected with a mechanical and material philosophy and with that crude dogmatism of uncritical thought which erects nature into an independent and self-sufficing system. A few echoes of scholastic realism make the doctrine complete.

This distinctness of individuality on which we have been dwelling reduces many potent phrases, as "race-experience," to mere figures of speech. The experience of an individual, being inalienable, cannot be inherited or transmitted. Of course the so-called facts of mental heredity remain; but when we eliminate from these all that is figurative they are reduced to a similarity, more or less striking, between the mental traits of the ancestor and those of the descendant. How this similarity is produced is a special problem; to explain it by heredity is simply to offer the name of the problem for its solution. To suppose the experience to be handed along bodily is to fall into one of the many mythologies of the imagination. Refraining from these follies, we have left a graded series of minds of greater or less similarity; but the cause of the series and the reason of the similarity remain in the highest degree obscure. If we think to help the matter by saying that at least the process is natural the claim may be admitted, in the sense that the facts succeed one another in a certain phenomenal order. To make "natural" mean more than this is to plunge into the

depths of dogmatic metaphysics. The conception which commonly underlies the claim is that nature is a closed dynamic system, self-centered and self-administering; and this is merely the apotheosis of crude and uncritical thinking.

So far we have considered only the existence of minds; we have found the difficulties of the problem covered up by irrelevant verbal thinking. Evolution is also supposed to have great significance for the contents of these minds. Here evolution is no longer a cosmical formula or a biological doctrine, but a psychological theory. The unity of the name must not lead us to overlook the difference of the thing. In this field the doctrine is mainly the familiar sensational psychology, renamed and furnished with some sonorous biological phrases and with the unmanageable notion of a race experience. New names and fresh paint are such powerful rejuvenating agents that were it not for a law of Congress all the old hulks afloat would renew their youth. Speculative doctrines often undergo rejuvenescence by an analogous process. Our new psychology, that is, our old sensational psychology with a new name, points out that the beginnings of the mental life consist of simple sensations and animal wants and instincts. All higher forms of mentality, and especially all moral manifestations, come later. Hence it is concluded that the higher are evolved from the lower, and that if we should reduce our mental life to its essential factors we should find only the selfish wants and instincts of animal life.

But here again we confound the description of the order of mental development with a theory of its conditioning ground. On the one hand, there is no doubt that the order of mental development is that just described, and, on the other, it is equally plain that the conclusion is utterly false. In the history of the human body there is a successive appearance of facts and functions of which the infant body shows at first no trace, such as teeth, beard, reproductive functions; but these cannot be explained as accidents of the physical life, but rather as successive manifestations of a law of growth which implies all these stages. So in the development of a fruit tree. There is a long period of growth in which no hint is given of blossoms and fruit; and yet when they come they can be viewed only as manifesta-

tions of an essential law which expresses the nature of the tree and determines the order and stages of its development. The same is true of a mind. There is an order of development; but that order can in no way be understood without assuming an inner law as its foundation. And as the true nature of an apple tree is not fully revealed in the leaves alone, but only in the whole cycle of manifestation, so the true nature of a mind is revealed, not in simple sensations alone, but only in its entire cycle of manifestation. Without this assumption we cannot explain mental development at all. The several phases of mental unfolding can in no way be identified. The lower may precede the higher and condition its unfolding, but it cannot of itself pass into the higher. The ground of progress must be sought, not in the antecedents, but in the essential nature of the mind itself.

The claim often heard, that the moral nature is only a phase of the brute nature, is barely intelligible at best, and is quite false in its intended meaning. It is our old friend, the fallacy of the universal, over again. It classifies various feelings together and supposes that they are thereby identified in fact. This notion disappears as soon as we recall the distinction between verbal thinking and concrete thinking. Things are not made alike by being classed together. Their union in a class may give a common point of view which has logical convenience; but as soon as we have to deal with reality we must go back to the things themselves. When, then, we class a number of feelings together we do nothing to the feelings. They remain what they were, with their differences as well as their likenesses; and for their understanding we have to leave the formal identifications of logic and betake ourselves to experience itself. Most of the identifications of the theory are of this formal sort. They are not concrete but abstract; they do not represent reality, but only logical manipulation. But in popular thought when the terminology of evolution is let loose upon animal elements they are supposed to develop into moral elements, yet not into truly moral elements; they rather remain animal elements as at first. Thus the baseness of the raw material infects the product, and the moral nature is shown to be of the earth, earthy. The popular speculator is so little conscious of his own aim that he really does not know whether there is a develop-

ment or not. If you deny the possibility of such evolution he turns on a flood of words with amazing volubility and proves it possible. If you accept the development and emphasize the moral nature he then points out that it is not truly moral, but only disguised animalism. This dreary verbal seesaw needs no further discussion.

Mr. Darwin himself, as well as his disciples, seems to have fancied that his view of a gradual development of human faculties has immense significance for psychology and philosophy, and especially for morals. This opinion rested partly upon the fancy just mentioned, that such a development can be worked without assuming an inner law as its determining ground; partly also on the fancy that the derived must be untrustworthy; and finally on the failure to distinguish between the order of mental genesis and the question of philosophical value. The first fancy has been sufficiently noted; the second one is a curious inheritance from an obsolete psychological doctrine, and is, too, a contradiction of evolution itself. For if faculty is really developing, if insight is really being evolved, then our minds in their last, and not in their earliest, stages are the true court of appeal. If we are not developing toward knowledge of course all thinking is at an end. But in either case it is quite absurd to appeal either to babies or to some primitive polyp to settle philosophical questions. If it is no reflection upon the mature mind that it was once in the embryonic state of infancy and the whimsical stage of childhood, so also it is no reflection upon it that it was preceded by others whose development never went beyond an animal stage. As to the other point mentioned, it is sufficient to say that the psychological genesis and history of our ideas are one thing; their philosophical value is quite another.

A final misinterpretation of evolution is to be noticed in the field of religion. Writers of the evolution school largely agree in tracing religious belief to some low primitive form, as fetichism or animism. Some hold that the belief in ghosts, arising from dreams and pathological phenomena, was the primal form of religion; and from this unseemly, or at least unpromising, beginning all the various forms of religion, even the highest, have been evolved. The common inference from such views is that the

nature and truth of religion are determined by its earliest form. If, then, we would find the essence of religion we must look to its embryonic manifestation. The truth of religion also must depend on the tenability of its rudimentary conceptions. If we find the belief in ghosts to be the earliest form of religious conception we must view the latest and highest forms as only sublimations of that primitive faith. If we no longer believe in ghosts we must prepare to see all the sublimated phases of that faith vanish with its grosser forms. Probably most of those who hold such views as to the historical origin of religion are convinced that they have an important bearing upon the truth of religion. We see, it is said, how the religious idea arises, and we have only to invoke evolution to see how it unfolds.

It is curious to the origin of this fancy. The mind spontaneously gives all its objects a substantive form, no matter whether they be proper things or not. Language has comparatively few nouns which stand for real things, most nouns representing only a conceptual existence. But when an idea has once taken on the substantive form we easily mistake it for a kind of thing and apply attributes to it which are meaningless except when applied to things. Again, we think under the law of identity; and hence our ideas, when once defined, come to have a fixed meaning for thought. When, then, we speak of the development of ideas we tend to think of the ideas themselves as developing or evolving, and yet as never going beyond the abiding essence which the law of identity demands. In the case in hand the primal religious idea is supposed to develop, and yet it never gets beyond its original self. By developing it unfolds itself into the myriad forms of religion; and by the law of identity it is kept to its primal essence. But that essence was, say, a belief in ghosts. No one, then, who has given up the primitive faith in ghosts can long keep its offshoot or outgrowth, religion.

Now, in all this the fallacy of the universal is full-blown. The mind merely chases its own shadow and mistakes its verbal manipulations for a real process in the thing. But as soon as we get away from verbal thinking to the fact we see that a belief or idea is nothing which can develop itself. Just as little can it have an abiding objective essence which remains un-

changed through its several phases. This would be logical and psychological mythology. Except in a figurative sense a belief does not admit of being developed at all. A developed belief is another belief. As a mental act or affirmation a belief exists only in the act or affirmation; and when the affirmation is changed there is no abiding essence which glides over from the old to the new, but a new affirmation is made. If we viewed the modern house as developed from the wigwam we should hardly suppose either that the wigwam evolved itself into the house or that there was a wigwam essence which remained unchanged throughout the evolution and constituted the true nature of the house. The development of the wigwam into the house means the tearing down of the wigwam and replacing it by the house. So in the case in question. If the alleged genesis of religion were historically correct it would not mean that the primal religious conception developed itself or that it was developed into anything else. It would rather mean that human beings in a given stage of progress formed certain conceptions of things unseen, while other human beings in another stage of progress replaced these conceptions by other and higher ones. Fetichism, animism, ghostism, polytheism, monotheism, pantheism, Christianity—these are not phases of a common belief, except in a verbal sense or in the sense of logical classification; in reality and apart from the verbal identities of logic, they are different conceptions which men have formed concerning the invisible world.

The fancy that what was historically first was the raw material out of which the others were made is a meaningless whimsey of the imagination. The fancy that the first belief is the standard by which the others must be judged is equally whimsical and groundless. As well might we say that astrology is the real essence of astronomy, and that to believe modern astronomy is to accept ancient astrology, since the former has developed out of the latter. And finally, if the historical genesis of religion were agreed upon, the truth of the competing conceptions would remain an open question. This could not be settled by any study of evolution. To make such an attempt would be like settling the claims of chemistry by reciting the history of alchemy. The question of truth must be transferred to the court of philosophy, whose function it is to study the

grounds and worth of belief, in distinction from its genesis and history. If religion began as animism it is now animism in the same sense in which astronomy is now astrology or chemistry is now alchemy. And, as it is no reproach to these sciences that their beginnings were both crude and unsavory, so it is no reproach to religion that its early forms were both crude and superstitious. This, indeed, is characteristic of all early conceptions, scientific and religious alike. A good part of early science was sheer superstition, and the rest was largely mistaken. But this fact has not the slightest significance for the truth of our present conceptions. A moment's reflection shows this. Yet by dint of talking and much reference to evolution this historical order of genesis has been supposed to reveal in religious ideas an essence of abiding baseness, and also to furnish a standard of their truth. To resume the illustration already given, this is like refuting astronomy and chemistry by belaboring astrology and alchemy. So fearful are the ravages of verbal thinking.

To sum up the matter, it is plain that evolution, in what I have called the scientific sense, is a perfectly harmless and not over-important doctrine. In itself it is as good as any other, and, when proved, or in so far as proved, it is better than any other. It is equally plain that most of the conclusions drawn from it do not follow. The mass of what passes for evolution in popular literature and discussion is bad metaphysics, worse logic, and hearsay science. The term itself has become so vague that it is much to be desired that the distinguished clergymen who now and then make a sensation among the reporters by announcing themselves as believers in evolution would accompany their profession of faith with some interpreting definition. Without this the performance is not altogether unlike expressing a belief in things in general.

Borden P. Bourne.

ART. II.—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

It is now ten years since Mr. Arnold came to America and gave lectures in some of our cities. He followed in this the example of Thackeray and Dickens, and if his hearing was smaller than theirs it was quite as attentive and appreciating. These men, seeking their own pleasure or profit, gratified our curiosity and stimulated us to read and value their writings, and thus did us an abiding service. Arnold was of noble presence, of kindly, earnest face, and his rich hair, parting and clustering in generous masses, was in that winter of 1883 just sable silvered. He was no orator; his tones were pleasant, but low and slow of utterance, and his drawl was unspeakable. For all that, to cultivated audiences the charm of his personal composure, the beauty of his thought, and the clear, incisive quality of his silvery rhetoric made him very welcome. During his lifetime Mr. Arnold was well rather than widely known among his countrymen as a man of letters and as a thinker. Nor since his sudden death, in 1887, has this statement needed any modification. Yet he was appreciated by his contemporaries; and his works will receive from posterity by just award a permanent place in the ever-lengthening scroll of our English classics, which Americans also claim, seeing that we read them without translations.

Matthew Arnold was born December 24, 1822, in Laleham, England. His father, Thomas Arnold, eminent as clergyman and historian, was still more eminent as a teacher. At Matthew's birth he was privately fitting students for the universities. Later he entered upon his career as head master at Rugby, where many a Tom Brown came to love and respect him. He knew the good and the ill of English boys, as with all their faults the most sincere, energetic, and self-centered of the human race, and with wonderful skill he trained them in sound learning and, still better, in devout and generous sentiments. Molded to his ideals, more than one of his pupils became, like Dean Stanley, a leader and a blessing to the generation following. Matthew was his elder son. Another, William De-la-field, early worn out in the educational work of India, died on his homeward route and was buried at Gibraltar; and the

grave of his noble wife is shown beneath the mighty shadow of the Himalayas. In Matthew's boyhood the home of the Arnolds was made at Fox How, in the Lake region, near the cottage of Wordsworth. Here in his vacations the father studied; and here the son could see the Lake Poets, Coleridge, Southey, and Wordsworth. To Fox How, thus a haunt of the muses, streamed in pilgrimage a line of visitors eminent for literary gifts and sympathies; and young Matthew, who even early "seemed no vulgar boy," could catch the deep things of reason and the sweet things of song. Most reverently sat the lad at the feet of these philosophers and poets.

In 1840, having studied under his father, he entered Balliol College, Oxford, and three years later gained a prize for an English poem. Two years later he was made a fellow of Oriel College. In 1846 he became private secretary to Lord Lansdowne, and so remained for several years. He also—after his marriage with Frances Wightman, daughter of an eminent jurist—served for thirty-four years as her majesty's inspector of British schools. He became in 1857 professor of poetry at Oxford. This office he held for ten years. Occasional poems, oftenest on simple themes, as the death of "Geist," his terrier, or of "Matthias," his canary, afterward appeared, and his "Westminster Abbey," written on the death of Dean Stanley, has the deep tone and solemn movement of a funeral anthem. His later years were given to educational work, to essays, critical and æsthetic, and to public addresses. Death came suddenly—a collapse at some muscular exertion—before either mind or body showed symptoms of decay. The simplicity and unworldliness of his life may be illustrated by the fact that from all his labors he had gathered an estate of only a thousand pounds!

Mr. Arnold's first stir of thought was from Wordsworth, not Wordsworth in his prime, the flush "high priest of man and nature and of human life," but from the venerable laureate when his utterances were beginning to have "the sweetness, the gravity, the beauty, and the languor of death." The son of Thomas Arnold inherited lofty energies; it is a pity that these were impaired by the contemplative egotism of the father's next friend and neighbor. At the time, too, when impressions deep and lasting were easily made on Matthew's mind, Goethe, artist and critic of more than one generation, went to

his grave. How men raved of him! "Knowest thou," says Carlyle, "no prophet, even in the vesture, environment, and dialect of this age? I know him and name him Goethe. In him man's life begins again to be divine." Goethe had at first held the principles of Rousseau. Later, with the serenity of a Brahman and the tone of a Delphic oracle, he announced that the chief end of man is "to cultivate his own spirit." This utterance fell like a gospel on Arnold's ear; he gave himself to expound and enforce it, to engraft it on the literature of his period, and to embody it in the English character and manners. To him we owe that sense of the word "culture" so hard to state, but often synonymous with "life in the spirit" and other words and phrases, such as "perfection," "sweetness and light," "harmonious development," and the like. A better pleader for the new "development" could hardly have been found. Clear and graceful in statement, gentle under criticism, patient under reproof, and witty in reply, he seemed chiefly to fail in what both the sacred and the profane oracles enjoin as the first step in culture—the understanding of himself.

When he was in the receptive undergraduate mood Oxford was still shedding on its children those "last enchantments of the Middle Ages" which can never wholly vanish from its halls and groves. The venerable university "has more criticism now; more knowledge, more light; but such voices as those of my youth it has no longer. They haunt my memory still." Cardinal Newman, not yet a Catholic, seemed destined to revive and spiritualize, if not transform, the Church of England. He entranced young Arnold, who forty years later seemed still to hear him saying: "After the fever of life, after wearinesses and sicknesses, fightings and despondings, languor and fretfulness, struggling and succeeding; after all the changes and chances of this troubled, unhealthy state—at length comes death, at length the white throne of God, at length the beatific vision." The young man heard Goethe say through Carlyle: "Here in the marble sleeps undecaying the fair image of the Past; in your hearts, also, it lives and works. Travel, travel, back into life! Take along with you this holy earnestness, for earnestness alone makes life eternity." And now to him from Massachusetts "a clear, pure voice" brought a strain as new and moving and unforgettable as the strain of Newman

or Carlyle or Goethe. "What Plato has thought, he [the man in you] may think; what a saint has felt, he may feel; what at any time has befallen any man, he can understand." Such utterances charmed Arnold's heart and gave to all his doings a noble tone and a transcendent temper.

His general view of the human race is that back of social appearances we are utterly separate, each a lone islander by himself in "the unplumbed, salt, estranging sea:"

Yes, in the sea of life enisled,
With echoing straits between us thrown,
Dotting the shoreless, watery wild,
We mortal millions live *alone*.

By this isolation it comes that none can be his brother's keeper. Some strong-lunged islander may call to his fellow, but nothing more. This being the environment, the first quality to be cultivated is endurance, more that of Zeno than of Paul. Patience under an order of things not of our making is a teaching traceable through all his poetry and prose. Then comes in many a pleasing form the lesson of "self-centering:"

And with joy the stars perform their shining,
And the sea its long, moon-silvered roll;
For self-poised they live, nor pine with noting
All the fever of some differing soul.
Bounded by themselves and unregardful
In what state God's other works may be,
In their own tasks all their powers pouring,
These attain the mighty life you see.

In the "hopeless tangle of our age," to which he is keenly alive and which he explores, though to do so be a task of sorrow, "alone, self-poised, henceforward man must labor." "No man can save his brother's soul nor pay his brother's debt." As a man is thus set apart from his fellow, "self-perfecting," "self-culture" are his duty and his chief concern. By this "culture" Mr. Arnold means the unfolding of every power enfolded within us and the perfect adapting of ourselves to the island of our Crusoe life. This culture is not gained by "Philistine" expedients, by unions, cooperations, and harangues, with "tremendous cheers." It is of, for, and by one's self, save as the perfume of one "islet" may be wafted to another. It can be achieved by nothing save patient personal effort.

Here Mr. Arnold looks back longingly to the feudal age and

the Periclean. The evil communications of the present corrupt good manners. He seems to say, "Any former times were better than these." Such temper could not well come into practical politics; it is too remote, unformulated, and unitemized, not to say fastidious. Pure as Arnold's motives were known to be, he was too dainty to serve in a party, even in that of Mr. Gladstone. He scouted "equality," and preferred benevolence to democracy. As a result the "sweetness and light" shed from his "islet" were little felt by the masses; they were hardly as effective as an aurora borealis. *Punch* summed up as follows his discourses to the laboring classes and all other classes:

To Matthew Arnold hark,
With both ears all avidity!
That Matthew—a man of mark—
Says "cultivate lucidity!"

Mr. Arnold's educational efforts were steady and sincere. Indeed, like his brother, he had the teacher's zeal for his inheritance. He served well and wisely in many and various school offices, of which one need not here speak particularly. His part was a large one in entering young women in England upon university study, so that Newnham College at Cambridge and Girton at Oxford are already too narrow for their throngs, and young women have taken the first honors in Greek and mathematics. His pleading for literature in courses of study, as against the exclusive pursuit of science and the "practical" branches, was earnest and eloquent. He held that education means knowing ourselves and the world, and for this we should know the best that has been thought and said in the world. True it is that *belles-lettres* may be so treated as to yield only a smattering benefit; but its study should be a serious search for truth. "Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased?" a young man explained to him (as examiner) to mean, "Can you not wait upon the lunatic?" "Is it not better," he asks, "to understand Shakespeare than to know that the combustion of wax produces water and carbonic acid?" Especially he urged the study of poetry, holding with Aristotle that poetry is more truthful and serious than history, and with Wordsworth that it is "the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge," "the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science." He is sure that

man's sense of beauty and sense of conduct give life three fourths of its meaning, and that these demand the study of literature and, most of all, that best of human products, the Greek literature.

"To attain perfect culture we must be perfectly religious, and for this we must properly understand the Bible." Arnold was no atheist, and in no sympathy with Colenso, Baur, Clifford, or Ingersoll, destroyers of the faith once delivered to the saints and givers of nothing in its place. He cannot "stand by the sea of time and listen to the solemn, rhythmic beating of its waves" without feeling that "Moody and Sankey are masters of the philosophy of history" and that "Christianity is the greatest and happiest stroke ever yet made for human perfection." Just as perfection in art, salvation in art, will never be reached without knowing Greece, so perfection in conduct, salvation in conduct, the way of peace, can be reached only with the Bible and Christianity.

But here begins his departure. He holds that, as the ages roll, religion unfolds new aspects and meanings, while the old decay and disappear. In our day "every creed is shaken, every dogma questioned, every tradition dissolving." The incarnation, the resurrection of Jesus, the atonement as preached by Moody, the supernatural in Christian history, these he seems to reject as "materialized" conceptions of ruder ages. Even the doctrine of the Trinity he can speak of as "a fairy tale of the three Lord Shaftesburys." "Be ye perfect," said the great Teacher, and this, says Mr. Arnold, is the harmonious development of all sides of our humanity. "Something Mr. Moody and his hearers have got from Jesus that does them good; but if he bases Christian salvation on a story like covenant redemption he shows a want of intellectual seriousness. To the more educated class belief in Mr. Moody's story is impossible now; to the religious middle class it will be impossible soon." "There is an enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," says he, cloudily. "The method and secret" of Jesus were commendable; the "method" was repentance, the "secret" was peace; but the Christian religion rests on the assumption of a personal ruler, and "this cannot be verified." Even the resurrection, poorly understood by Paul, is in fact "a rising to that harmonious conformity with the real and the eternal

which is life and peace, until it becomes glory." How reassuring to know that Moody still tells the old, old story, as once in Arnold's presence, that the common people hear it gladly, and that, while Arnold has said,

Resolve to be thyself! And know that he
Who finds himself loses his misery,

many in finding the Saviour are losing their misery! Yet this brilliant disbeliever has longings that he does not quite conceal. He seems, in spite of some pride of reason, to yearn for faith in Jesus such as his father had, such as was easy when

Men called from chamber, church, and tent,
And Christ was by to save.

He would gladly have been himself caught in the tide

Of love which set so deep and strong
From Christ's then open grave.

But, turning sadly away, he says:

Now he is dead! Far hence he lies
In the lorn Syrian town;
And on his grave, with shining eyes,
The Syrian stars look down.

At last we seem to find this gifted and fascinating man, Christian born and Christian bred, sinking into such pantheism as our missionaries confront in India:

Myriads who live, who have lived,
What are we all but a mood,
A single mood, of the life
Of the Spirit in whom we exist,
Who alone is all things in one?

Genial and kindly as Arnold is, he seems with condescending air to look from his "islet" upon "the un-Hellenic public" and to say, "Cultivate your own spirit," "Cherish light and sweetness," and "Look at me and aspire to your own best self." This delicate self-worship is so characteristic of Goethe that it is no wonder if we find a suspicion of it in his admirer. It is not pleasant to classify Arnold with Marcus Aurelius, Goethe, Carlyle, and Emerson in that "marge" of the "Inferno," the limbo of the good heathen, "who served not God aright," though "all their words were tuneful sweet;" but where else shall we put him?

His first volume of poems, given nameless to the world in 1849, made us start as if another of the immortals were come, and so it proved. In song he followed those who were his masters in culture, striving "Wordsworth's sweet calm and Goethe's wide and luminous view to gain." He took up poetry seriously, believing its office is "to sustain, to console us, to interpret life for us." "For poetry the idea is everything; the rest is a world of illusion, of divine illusion. Poetry attaches its emotions to the idea; the idea is the fact. The strongest part of our religion to-day is its unconscious poetry." "Science, philosophy, religion are incomplete without it, and most of what now passes for them will be replaced by poetry." His poetry is, therefore, no idle warbling, but an intense criticism of life, in which he worked from an overmastering sense of duty. All his poems have dignity, grace, much of spiritual unrest and somewhat of the healing balm that nature gives.

Thus, after Rustum in desperate fight has, unawares, slain his son Sohrab, who, at dying, makes himself known, how quietly the Oxus leaves Sohrab in his gore and Rustum in his agony and tears!

But the majestic river floated on,
Out of the mist and hum of that low land,
Into the frosty starlight, and there moved,
Rejoicing, through the hushed Chorasmian waste
Under the solitary moon; . . .

. . . till at last
The longed-for dash of waves is heard, and wide
His luminous home of waters opens, bright
And tranquil, from whose floor the new-bathed stars
Emerge and shine upon the Aral Sea.

He comes to nature, not like Byron in "Childe Harold," to pour upon it his own "sparkling gloom," or like Coleridge at Chamouni, to fill it with his own lofty rapture, but only to find relief and rest. By the lake he says:

How sweet to feel, on the boon air,
All our unquiet pulses cease!

In his "Summer Night,"

And the calm moonlight seems to say,
"Hast thou, then, still the old unquiet breast?"

And further on he exclaims:

Ye heavens, whose pure dark regions have no sign
Of languor, though so calm and though so great,
And yet untroubled and unpassionate;

A world above man's head, to let him see
How boundless might his soul's horizon be.

In "Kensington Gardens" he says:

Calm soul of all things! make it mine
To feel, amid the city's jar,
That there abides a place of thine
Man did not make and cannot mar.

Nowhere in his pictures of nature, given in the most musical of English and in style flowing, bright, and tender do we find the deep gladness of Wordsworth or the organ-toned joy of Milton.

He is sad, unbelieving, and self-absorbed, and it is given him to sing the beautiful "as he thinketh in his heart." Sincerely as he worked for advance in education, in his poems the men of to-day lack greatness. "There hath passed away a glory from the earth." The wash of waves at Dover tells him, as the sigh of the Ægean told Sophocles, the endless tale of mortal sorrow. Christianity, that revived the old world when it was weary, is now in its turn "outworn," and men once more are waning. Therefore he goes far back for his heroes and even for his meters. His "Sick King in Bokhara" is truly dramatic, his completest work of art, and best displays his temper and genius. In none of his poems, nor in all of them together, do we as here find the whole of Mr. Arnold—his dignified self-poise, that unrest agreeing strangely with the calm of helplessness, that daintiness of allusion and transparent simplicity, and these rich and artistic in color and setting. How beautiful is this from "Tristram," that rhapsody from the fruitful Arthurian legends! It is a description of Iseult after the death of her husband and that of her rival, living with her children as in a dim and moonlit dream:

Joy hath not found her yet nor ever will.
Is it this thought that makes her mien so still,
Her features so fatigued, her eyes, though sweet,
So sunk, so rarely lifted save to meet

Her children's? She moves slow; her voice alone
Hath yet an infantine and silvery tone,
But even that comes languidly; in truth,
She seems one dying in the mask of youth.

On the whole, Mr. Arnold's best service to literature was in criticism. He freely admits that in literary work the creative power is greater than the critical power; its exercise is man's highest activity and gives him his highest happiness. Creative epochs are rare, because in them the power of the man must concur with the power of the moment as shown by its current ideas, on which creative power must operate. Thus the epochs of Elizabeth and of Pericles were from this concurrence so richly creative. The business of the critical power in all branches is "to see the object as in itself it really is." This should precede the exercise of the creative power, in order that this latter may know the material on which it is to work. The poet needs to read poetry widely and carefully that he may safely proceed to create his own. Then comes the critic's task to test and set forth the value of what is created.

The range of Arnold's criticism was wide. It reached from Homer to Shelley. The Celtic bards might rise to thank him for his service. Nor did he neglect the doctrines and movements of his own passing day. His views of Emerson were certainly free from illusion, at least from such as Americans may have. We who, in fervid youth, shook Emerson's hand and heard his charming voice were sure that a demigod was among us. At the Wesleyan University fifty years ago the "powerful mind" read and understood his "Essays." The others were as the people in Andersen's little story, where the emperor walks naked at the head of the procession, who are told that if they fail to see his royal apparel it is from some sin of their own; so all are eager to chant their praise of his magic robes. So we fell into unison with the "powerful mind." How many since have in chorus lauded poems incoherent and essays incomprehensible! And now Mr. Arnold, in his fearless effort to get at the best that is known and thought in the world, showed to a Boston audience why Emerson was not a great poet, not a great writer, not a great propounder of philosophy! "He is the friend and aider of those who would live in the spirit." Just what we average boys thought, but we dared not assume to

say it. Emerson had discoursed richly to us of honesty, veracity, and hope; but soon he was beyond us, and, like Browning's poetry, he is beyond us still. Only we saw him so serene and kindly as he voiced his Delphic enigmas. In efforts like this to learn and propagate the best that is thought and known in the world, to subject to fair but close scrutiny ideas, doctrines, and institutions, Arnold put forth his most serious exertions. There is a charm about his prose and about his poetry, though neither may reach the highest classic rank. If with his other gifts he had possessed the joy that comes of deep Christian faith, he would have diffused "sweetness and light" indeed.

One seems in all his writings to hear that sob of the *Ægean*, the plaint of a soul shut out from its highest satisfaction; but no English poet has shown soul-hunger so delicately or given negatives in form and color so fascinating. No English critic of our day has been more discriminating, clear, and instructive. His keen sparkle of insight and expression may be lost upon "the majority," but "the remnant," who in the long run rule the world's thinking, will not willingly let it die; and Arnold will stand as a helper of the human mind for his own generation and beyond. He will long be discernible in the perspective of our period's literature.

A. B. Hyde

ART. III.—THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND LAW OF MARRIAGE.

THE fact that the Roman Catholic doctrine of marriage holds it to be one of the seven sacraments is apt to induce in Protestants an apprehension of a wider difference from our view than really exists; while, on the other hand, at various subordinate but important points the difference is in fact much wider than is commonly understood. The consequence of this duplex misconception is a general dislocation of popular ideas among Protestants on the subject, a dislocation which sometimes appears where we should little expect it. We have, therefore, prepared the present statement of the Roman Catholic doctrine and law of marriage after a careful collation of high Catholic authorities continued for a number of years, and have aimed—while presenting with but little divergence into controversy the actual theory of the Church of Rome—at bringing into suitable relief those features of her doctrine concerning which it is peculiarly important that Protestants should be rightly informed. Particular pains have been taken, with the help of various eminent authors, to distinguish between positions as simply permitted, prevailing, universal, official, or of strictly dogmatic force. The latter are not so many as is commonly supposed.

In popular conception the widest difference between the Roman Catholic and the prevailing Protestant doctrine of marriage is that the former affirms and the latter denies marriage to be a sacrament. If this were really so, if Protestantism generally, like Luther himself, held marriage to be “a mere bodily thing,” leaving Rome to defend Christian marriage as having a far higher character, it would be very little to our honor. In reality, however, the controversy is rather over words than things. On the one hand, Rome, and that under the late and the present pontiffs, expressly declares marriage to be a contract. On the other hand, evangelical Protestantism everywhere acknowledges that Christ raised marriage to a specifically higher dignity than that of a contract, making it the channel both of natural blessings and of rich spiritual graces, such as enable a wedded pair to discharge their relation to each other

and to their offspring more perfectly. The two views, therefore, do not appear to differ essentially. Rome, accordingly, has authoritatively pronounced that a marriage between two baptized persons, seriously intended as a Christian union, does not become invalid from the mere fact that the parties do not call it sacramental. She even declares that to deprive it of this character there is required a positive "prevailing intention" in one of the parties that it shall not be a Christian marriage. In this latter case Rome holds that if not sacramental it is not a marriage at all.

The irreconcilable difference, therefore, between us and Rome lies, not in the sacramental doctrine, but in the almost unrestricted right claimed by her to prescribe conditions over and above those of natural morality on which alone the contract shall be valid. These not only respect her actual subjects, but largely extend to baptized Protestants. Thus, besides maintaining the invalidity of an undispensed marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person, not as intrinsic, but as of long-established ecclesiastical use, she holds all restrictions involving invalidity, or, as she calls them, diriment impediments, which have prevailed from before the separation, to be still in force for baptized Protestants. For instance, she pronounces void all undispensed marriages between all baptized persons whatever having the same great-grandparent, even when the fact was unknown. She is therefore logically bound to declare void the marriage of the Queen of England with the late prince consort and a great part of the marriages of Protestant princes, as well as countless private marriages. This impediment also applies to all standing in such a relation to a former husband or wife. Moreover, anyone, even a layman, baptizing another, becomes incapable, without a dispensation, of marrying the baptized person or his or her parent. The same disability rests on a sponsor at baptism or confirmation. And, as Rome directs that in matrimonial questions Protestant baptism shall be presumed valid, the same impediments, excepting as to confirmation, would be held to vitiate marriages between baptized Protestants.

The statement, however, so often made among us, that Rome accounts all marriages between Protestants as being merely "filthy concubinages," is so far from being true that it does not even apply to the above-mentioned marriages among us

which she accounts void. It is a well-settled principle of her ecclesiastical law that an invalid marriage not contrary to natural morality is so far to be considered that, when its invalidity is discovered, no Church censure shall be involved, provided the parties then separate or obtain a dispensation, and that children previously born shall be legitimate. Thus, soon after 1200 Innocent III, though requiring Philip Augustus of France to take back his lawful wife, Ingeborg, and to send away Agnes of Meran, made no difficulty in acknowledging Agnes's children as legitimate, since the marriage, though contracted in bad faith by the king, was contracted in good faith by Agnes on the strength of a sentence of the French bishops. Lately, also, the marriage of the Prince and Princess of Monaco was declared void, while their children, doubtless on the same ground, were pronounced legitimate. Roman doctrine therefore holds the subjective guilt of unchastity to be involved in marriages void on the ground of natural or spiritual relationship only when the impediment is known, and known by the contracting parties as applying to them, which of course does not hold good of Protestant marriages. In this latter case, if either party goes over to Rome a dispensation obtained "heals" the marriage, and may even "heal it in the root"—that is, give it retroactively the same juridical effects as if it had been valid from the beginning, including certain advantages not involved in ordinary legitimation. The phrase "filthy concubinages," occurring in an encyclical of Pius IX, is so far from applying to Protestant marriages that it does not even apply to irregular Roman Catholic marriages in Protestant countries. It is used solely of Roman Catholics in Roman Catholic countries who, knowing the law of the Council of Trent which requires for validity the presence of the Catholic pastor or his deputy to be prevailing there, content themselves with a merely civil marriage. In Protestant countries, with a few local exceptions, this *Lex Clau destinitatis*, as it is called, has never been proclaimed; while in Roman Catholic countries it is held not to apply to Protestants where their ecclesiastical system antedates the Council of Trent, and where, therefore, they have not been *de facto* members of the parishes in which it was published.

Before going further, however, let us consider the accepted Roman Catholic definition of marriage. It is this: Marriage

a mutual contract or consent, between a man and a woman capable of the relation, by which there is a present mutual surrender and acceptance, each of the other, as having the full rights, spiritual and physical, of the married state. Of course Rome teaches that marriage, binding and indissoluble, though not as yet a sacramental contract conveying specific grace, was instituted by God, as simply dual, in the garden of Eden. The question whether indissolubility and monogamy rested in the very nature of the relation or were simultaneously added by positive divine legislation is debated among Catholic theologians, with a prevailing tendency to the latter opinion. Accordingly, it is held that after the flood God, in view of human perversity, was able, without violating the absolute nature of his own institutions, which of course is impossible, to grant mankind a dispensation for polygamy and for divorce. Both dispensations, it is held, have been revoked by Christ for all mankind. The single dispensation which he is held to have granted under the new law will be mentioned presently.

In a wider sense all pure marriages from the beginning are viewed as having been sacramental, and before the fall in a very eminent degree. In the specific sense, however, in which the Church now uses the term "sacrament" only marriages between the baptized are held sacramental. Marriages between the unbaptized, if consonant with natural morality, are viewed as chaste, obligatory, and, so long as both parties remain unbaptized, indissoluble, but not as belonging to the supernatural order, and therefore not sacramental. If one of the parties is afterward baptized it is held that the Church, in this solitary case, has authority from Christ to pronounce a dissolution of a valid and consummated marriage, especially where the unbaptized party refuses to live "without contumely of the Creator." In this case alone permission is given to marry during the life of the other party. Where a Jewish wife, however, having been divorced by her husband, afterward becomes a Catholic, she may be forbidden to marry again if her husband is willing to renew the relation and to respect her Christian profession, every such divorce from a valid marriage, since Christ, being viewed by the Church as null. The Greek Church from an early time (at least since 692) has held heresy as a diriment impediment, absolutely voiding a subsequent marriage with an

orthodox Christian. The Roman Church has always held it to be merely an impeding impediment where the heretic is a baptized person, rendering the marriage without dispensation unlawful and punishable, sometimes even to the point of permanent separation, but leaving it sacramental and indissoluble if the prescribed conditions of validity be complied with. Priests in this country are said sometimes to frighten parishioners into believing such a marriage void. If so they must be either grossly ignorant or grossly fraudulent, and therefore liable to deposition.

The principal ground of Protestant confusion of idea respecting the Roman doctrine of marriage is the notion that sacramental means sacerdotal. This error might be corrected by observing that the fundamental sacrament, baptism, even when administered irregularly and censurably by a lay person or by a Jew or pagan, is received by the Church as valid if due attention is paid to manner, form, and ritual intent. Sacramental, therefore, does not of necessity mean sacerdotal. In the case of marriage, however (the one other sacrament administrable by lay persons), there are complications which need a more explicit development. Roman Catholic theology holds that Christ, as incarnate, has not created marriage nor altered its essence, but has elevated it for the baptized, and for them alone, from the simple order of nature into the supernatural or regenerate order of grace. Its substance, therefore, consists now, as always, in the mutual consent of parties competent to contract. But within the pale of baptism this consent, being no longer purely natural, but within the supernatural order (even though the contracting parties should not be at the time in a state of grace), is at once a consent and a sacrament. The priest, therefore, is not a minister of the sacrament, but the consenting parties are themselves, as Archbishop Heiss virtually expresses it, the complex minister. In the early Church the benediction of the bishop or, as numbers increased, of a presbyter was enjoined, as contributing to dignity, holiness, and full moral ratification, but not as intrinsically essential. Nor where an unbaptized couple have become Catholic has a renewal of their marriage ever been required by the Church, although of course we cannot answer for all the eccentricities of local ignorance or bigotry. The baptism of the married

pair, introducing them into the supernatural order, is held to raise their marriage, already valid, into sacramental sanctity, though some divines advise a private renewal of consent. There are those, it is true, who hold it, though remaining valid, to remain nonsacramental.

This view of the parties as being themselves the ministers of both the contract and the sacrament has always been the prevailing one. Previous to the Council of Trent simply consensual marriages were very frequent and, though censured, were acknowledged by the Church. Some divines, however, maintained such marriages to be void, no formal doctrine of faith having been published concerning them; and many, though still a decided minority, held them to be valid indeed, but not sacramental, viewing the priest, though not necessary to a true contract, as being yet essential to a true sacrament of marriage. The Council of Trent condemned the former opinion, but left the latter free. In a decree guarded by anathema and papally ratified, and therefore by the overwhelming majority viewed as irrevocably binding on faith, the council declares that "clandestine marriages," that is, marriages *sine parochio et testibus*, without clergyman and witness, are valid wherever the Church has not declared that they shall be void. The council, moreover, provides that the *Lex Clandestinitatis*, requiring for validity the presence of the parish clergyman or a deputed priest and two witnesses, shall not come into force in any parish until thirty days after a formal promulgation. Such a publication has never been made by Rome in parishes situated in Protestant countries (with some local exceptions), and has been revoked for mixed marriages in Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Poland, Ireland, Canada, the Rhine dioceses of Prussia, and various other regions. In these Catholic countries, therefore, Holland too being under the law of Trent, the validity of mixed marriages is independent of the presence of a clergyman; while in Protestant countries, speaking generally, marriages contracted by Roman Catholics themselves without a Catholic clergyman are held highly censurable indeed (except where clergymen are not to be had), but valid and indissoluble.

I have thus far treated it as the certain doctrine of Rome that whenever a marriage, sacerdotal or nonsacerdotal, between baptized persons is valid it is also sacramental. This is prac-

tically true, although even the allocution of September 27, 1852, given by Pius IX, not being distinctly *ex cathedra*, is not absolutely conclusive. Yet this so fully and authoritatively expresses and confirms the general judgment of the Church in all ages, declaring "that, between baptized persons [*inter fideles*], marriage cannot exist without being at one and the same time a sacrament," that it seems now to be agreed on all hands that the previous minority opinion, holding nonsacerdotal marriages contracted in regions not bound by the *Lex Clandestinitatis* as valid and binding indeed, but nonsacramental, can no longer be maintained. They must be acknowledged henceforth by all, as always by most, as valid, indissoluble, and sacramental.

The place of the parish clergyman, therefore, in his parish, of the bishop throughout his diocese, and of the pope throughout the Church, when confirming a marriage is not that of a celebrant in the strict sense, but of a "public witness," whose presence, where the Church requires it, is necessary to the validity of the contract and, indirectly, though not directly, of the sacrament. Accordingly, a parish clergyman, bishop, or pope when once instituted is immediately competent to ratify a marriage within his jurisdiction, even though not yet ordained to the priesthood, and therefore still incapable of any strictly sacerdotal act. A deputy, however, must always be a priest. Nor does an excommunicate pastor or bishop lose this right so long as he retains the title of his benefice. Nor is it needful for validity that he should utter a word. Indeed, in various cases of mixed marriage he is forbidden to speak a word, rendering only what is called "passive assistance." His presence is esteemed sufficient for ratification even when compelled; nay, where, being carried bodily to the nuptials, he has covered his eyes and ears so that he could neither hear nor see. Rome has pronounced the marriage firm, since he could have heard and seen if he would, and therefore was morally present. Intention and activity are necessary in the administration of a sacrament; but as he is here only a required witness, in certain parts of the Church, while it is the parties who administer the sacrament to themselves, his mere bodily presence is sufficient. Even when, as commonly, he uses the words "I join you," this is merely a solemn ratification of the sacramental consent of the parties which, alone, is intrinsically indispensable, and may

be given either by words or signs, either by themselves or by an accredited agent. Many people have a vague idea that without the nuptial benediction they are hardly married. The Church, however, does not require this benediction, or always allow it. Mixed marriages, even when sacerdotally celebrated, are not blessed, nor even a second marriage of a widow. The clergy are directed to instruct their people that the nuptial benediction "appertains to the greater solemnity of marriage, but not to its essence."

Rome holds and teaches that a sacramental marriage is indissoluble by any power on earth when once the parties have lived together as husband and wife. If they have not, then even a sacramental marriage is dissolved by a monastic profession of either party or by a papal dispensation. There are thus three stages of marriage. Those between the unbaptized are simply *vera*. Those between the baptized are *vera atque rata*. These latter are absolutely indissoluble only when they are *vera, rata, atque consummata*. The Council of Trent, however, although it anathematizes all who shall maintain "that the Church errs when she has taught and teaches, according to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine, that the bond of marriage cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the parties," has, nevertheless, taken care to abstain from directly anathematizing the different doctrine of the Greek Church, which holds, like most Protestants, that even the bond of marriage, if not dissolved, is at least dissolvable by adultery. Rome, having never accused the Greek Church of heresy, but only of schism, and revering her unmistakable and conspicuous zeal for doctrinal orthodoxy, which appears in her very title of the orthodox oriental Church, has been unwilling to make the breach irreparable by denouncing her as heretical. Accordingly, the Greek and prevailing Protestant position, though plainly contradicted by the declarations of Trent, may, it appears, be defended without the imputation of actually opposing the faith; and it is doubtful whether, in that one tenth or one fifteenth of the Roman Catholic Church which adheres to the Eastern rites and discipline, the Eastern doctrine of marriage may not be quietly acted upon with the tacit allowance of Rome, which has as good a capacity as the rest of us, not to say a better, of shutting her eyes and ears to any variations of opinion or prac-

tice which it might be impossible to suppress. We hazard this conjecture, however, only as agreeing very well with her general relations to her subjects of the Eastern rites, not as a matter of certain knowledge, although it is confirmed by the immediate occasion which moved Trent to intermit the anathema, namely, the fear of driving certain affiliated Eastern communions into revolt.

In the West, of course, for many centuries, although marriages innumerable, especially those of princes and of nobles, have been severed by the Church on the most trivial pretenses, these separations have never been divorces in our sense, but declarations of original nullity. It is said, and apparently on excellent evidence, that the ecclesiastical courts in England under the earlier Tudors parted man and wife as recklessly as even our American courts. They always did so, however, under the pretense of an original flaw, thus consecrating venal looseness by unctuous hypocrisy. The Reformation has elevated the standard of married fidelity, as of general morality and devotion, in England (though perhaps at the expense of a temporary decline of both), and the counter-reformation has greatly purified the ecclesiastical courts of Rome; while Trent, by cutting off a large part of the old impediments to marriage, has compelled a much stricter procedure in these courts. On the whole, therefore, contemporary Catholicism practically holds its adherents to the matrimonial theory of the Church. The dissolution under military constraint of Napoleon and Josephine's marriage, and on the pretence of nullity of that of Jerome and Elizabeth Patterson, was tolerated, but never confirmed, by the high-minded Pius VII.

We hear so much in history of Henry VIII's application for a divorce that we are apt, mixing modern practice with the older theory, to misconceive the case fundamentally. Henry never dreamed of asking the pope to allow him to marry a second wife while his first was living. Setting aside some flitting notions of bigamy (like that of Philip of Hesse, afterward reluctantly sanctioned by Luther) which, though ventilated by a cardinal, would undoubtedly have been rejected by the Church with horror, Henry, with universal Western Christendom, viewed a second valid marriage while his first wife was living as impossible. What he desired was that the pope should

declare that Catherine, as his brother's widow, had never really been his wife, since the papal permission had trenched upon a prohibition, not of the Church, but of God, and was therefore void; as, for instance, all allow that a dispensation for a father to marry a daughter would be wholly ineffective and abominable. Opinions were seriously divided. Between the emperor, Catherine's nephew, and the king, her husband, Clement VII was at his wit's end; and the famous University of Bologna boldly gave sentence for Henry. His case, therefore, was not so frivolous as we, in our just reverence for Isabella's noble daughter, have been wont to imagine.

There is one feature of Catherine's case which seems to show that the Roman Catholic law of marriage was as yet vagner than now. It was proposed to her to enter into "lax religion," by taking a vow of continence, without espousing a monastic rule, thus leaving her husband free to marry again. But such a vow, taken by a married mother, would now have no force whatever to dissolve the bond of marriage, even though permitted or solicited by the husband. Henry, therefore, after marrying Anne, accounted her his first, not his second, wife. After tiring of her and obtaining a second declaration of nullity from his obsequious primate he esteemed Jane Seymour as really his first wife; and this marriage was never questioned. At the close of his life he only acknowledged himself as having been the husband of two wives, Jane Seymour and Catherine Parr, passing over in silence the status of Catherine Howard. The ground on which he declared null his marriage with Anne Boleyn, namely, that she had been precontracted to another man, would now be viewed by Rome as staining a subsequent marriage, but not voiding it. In those days of consensual marriages, however, when betrothals varied uncertainly between contracts *de futuro* and *de præsenti*, it was easy, where the interests of the great required, to represent a betrothal as really a marriage and, therefore, as a diriment impediment to a subsequent union.

It is often said, as for instance in a volume of Unitarian essays, that Rome, for money, will license a princely or ducal applicant to commit the sin of incest. This accusation is unjust. Rome holds herself incompetent, under any circumstances, to grant a dispensation for marriage between an ascendant and descendant or a brother and sister. She does not hold a

marriage between an uncle and niece or between an aunt and nephew as forbidden by God, but only by the Church, from an unquestionable sense of decency and reverence. What the Church forbids, not God, the Church, it is held, may, on grave grounds, especially of public policy, allow. The late Duke of Aosta, therefore, in marrying Letitia Bonaparte under papal license, was not, in the view of Rome or in his own, guilty of incest, but the true husband of a true wife, his marriage with whom, having been invalid only because ecclesiastically forbidden, became valid as soon as ecclesiastically allowed. Rome might well be asked how she could justify the violation of natural reverence involved in such a marriage. The State might well be asked the same. We may well assume that the Unitarian accuser of Rome and of King Amadeus, as well as his ten thousand orthodox associates, if they met with an uncle and niece, or even an aunt and nephew, legally married, would not summon them to separate as living in incest, as they would a brother and sister. Then why do they accuse Rome, not accusing the State, of licensing the sin of incest?

For a marriage between a stepparent and stepchild, where the violation of reverence due to both the living and the dead is so shockingly gross, Rome never concedes a dispensation. Whatever her faults of theory or of administration (and the latter, in past ages rather than in present, have often been enormous), she has never accepted the absolutely animal theory of John Bright, who proposed that the law should recognize no restraints on marriage except such as are purely physical; so that, if science should give assurance that a particular union between parent and child involved no danger of congenital imperfection to descendants, he would have been bound, on his own showing, to allow it. Our entire way of viewing certain social selections formed by marriage as inducing a moral impediment to subsequent marriages within their limits we are now told is finical and prudish, and that it does not fall within the competency of the State, or apparently of the Church, to enforce pudicity. Physical detriment, we are assured, is the only thing against which legislation has any right to guard. I need not say that this "pig philosophy," as Carlyle would call it, has never been acknowledged by Rome, any more than by general Christianity, by Judaism, by Mohammedanism, or, with the monstrous exception of Zoroas-

trianism, by any ethically developed school of paganism. That it prevails so widely and increasingly in our country is simply one of the many proofs of that individualistic self-will which says of every moral restraint that deals with interests not coarsely palpable, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."

I have said that an undisputed marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person is held by Rome to be absolutely null. With a dispensation it is accounted valid and indissoluble. The question is debated whether it is sacramental for the baptized party. Yet as the consent is mutual, and as the unbaptized party is confessedly incapable of giving a sacramental consent, the negative side asks with force how the nuptial contract can be sacramental. If a marriage of this kind, contracted with authority, is disturbed by contumelious and persecuting behavior on the part of the unbaptized partner, the Church authorizes a Catholic thus fettered to apply for a separation, but not for a divorce *a vinculo*. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore publishes in its proceedings a series of questions on this subject sent from this country and answered by Rome. The answers of Rome are to this general effect: If the deserting husband was the son of Baptists he is to be presumed unbaptized, and his forsaken wife, as her union with him was null, may marry again. If he was the son of parents belonging to a sect allowing infant baptism, but not requiring it, he is to be presumed unbaptized, and she may marry again. If his parents were zealous members of a zealously pedobaptist sect he is to be presumed baptized, and she must wait till his death, unless, of course, she learns positively that he was unbaptized. If his parents were indifferent members of a zealously pedobaptist sect the detailed evidence may be transmitted to Rome, which will then decide. If one parent was a zealous and the other an indifferent pedobaptist the decision depends on the question which of them controlled the religious education of the son.

These questions show how far Rome is from desiring to deal lightly with the marriages of baptized Protestants. She directs, moreover, that where the fact of baptism is ascertained its validity shall always be assumed, *in ordine ad matrimonium*. We Protestants are famous for finding mares' nests in the Roman Catholic Church. For instance, every now and then it is

announced with bated breath, as a mystery lately excavated out of the Roman catacombs or the Vatican grottoes, that the Church actually allows that under some conditions even Protestants may be saved—a mere commonplace of Catholic, especially of Jesuit, theology, for generations past. So also it is sometimes announced as a wonderful proof of growing liberality that a sister of charity has been allowed to marry, and has even been married with great state in a Roman Catholic cathedral! Now this signifies nothing in the world. A sister of charity engages herself but for a year at a time. When this expires she is always free to marry, and there is no more reason why she should not be married in state than why any other Catholic woman should not be. Even the marriages of nuns proper and of monks not in major orders, though involving excommunication, are in large measure received as valid. Nuns in this country and England, with some exceptions, are only admitted to take simple vows. Moreover, all monks, friars, and nuns (unless by special papal allowance) are now required, for the first three years after their profession, to remain under simple vows. But simple vows are only an impedient, not a diriment, impediment to marriage; that is, they render it censurable, but leave it sacramental and indissoluble. In the case of the Jesuits alone simple vows are a diriment impediment, except after dismissal from the society. So long, therefore, as a woman is not admitted to solemn vows, and so long as a man is either not under solemn vows or ordained a subdeacon, a contracted marriage is acknowledged, even though punished, by the Church. Holy orders, from subdeacon up, are allowed to be a diriment impediment to a subsequent marriage, unless, of course, there is a papal dispensation, or unless, as sometimes in the East, the ordination has taken place in early childhood, in which case Rome provides that the man, though spiritually retaining his orders, is yet free, on growing up, to live altogether as a layman if he will. A dispensed priest (of whom there are very few indeed) must, on marrying, surrender his functions, although he may shrive a penitent *in extremis*. A deacon or subdeacon (more easily dispensed) must surrender his not very important functions entirely. It is not certain that more than one bishop has been dispensed to marry since the present discipline was established. Talleyrand, it is true, was a bishop, but the pope

always refused to acknowledge his marriage. Cæsar Borgia, though an archbishop, had never been consecrated or even ordained a priest.

A paragraph peculiarly calculated to stir up animosity in Protestant minds has been widely circulated throughout the country, as follows: "Rome pronounces null and void every marriage not declared by one of her priests." Now, it would be impossible to compress a greater number of misstatements into so short a sentence. First, three fourths of human marriages, those of the unbaptized, are declared by Rome entirely out of her jurisdiction, but acknowledged by her as being, if agreeable to general Christian morality, chaste, binding, and licitly continuing even after the baptism of one or both the parties. Even a private renewal of consent, though suggested by some divines as a means of elevating these marriages to sacramental rank, is not required by the Church. Secondly, Rome punishes with the greater excommunication the assertion that nonsacerdotal marriages between baptized Christians are void outside the proclaimed limits of the *Lex Clandestinitatis*, and, since 1852 at least, frowns on the refusal to accept such nonsacerdotal marriages as being also sacramental. Thirdly, Rome has decided that, as the parties, not the clergy, are the ministers of the sacrament, it is not requisite, even under the *Lex Clandestinitatis*, that the celebrant should be an ordained priest, if only he has the title of a parochial or diocesan benefice. Fourthly, she has decided that his merely bodily presence suffices, without any declaration on his part whatever. This sentence, therefore, is a perfect Pandora's box of injurious and wholly unwarranted accusations and, if we regard the ninth commandment as having any application to our relations with Rome, should be revoked by its author and everywhere hunted down to extinction. Sharp controversy may be very salutary, but it is time that we began to dispatch controversial lies, as fast as we discover them, to their father, the devil.

As some parts of our country were until this century under French and others under Spanish dominion, the *Lex Clandestinitatis* for Roman Catholic marriages is still in force throughout a good many districts of the United States. We extract from Lehmkuhl's *Theologia Moralis* an exact account, dating from 1887, of the bounds within which Roman Catholic

marriages contracted without an authorized clergyman are pronounced by the Church null and void. It will serve to correct various exaggerated extensions of these limits of the *Lex Clandestinitatis*, and also to impress us with the singular degree to which Rome makes the validity of the marriage contract dependent on arbitrary external conditions. In this respect it may be doubted whether she does not exceed almost any civil government in Christendom, since a relation intrinsically the same in all respects is declared on one side of a surveyor's line a sacramental marriage, and on the other "a filthy concubinage." "The *Lex Clandestinitatis*, accordingly, is in force as controlling Roman Catholic marriages: (1) In the archiepiscopal provinces of New Orleans (extending to the west line of Georgia), Santa Fé (excepting northern Colorado), San Francisco, with Utah (excepting eastward of the Colorado River); in the diocese of Vincennes; in the city of St. Louis, with the suburbs of St. Genevieve, St. Ferdinand, and St. Charles; and in four parishes of the diocese of Alton, namely, Kaskaskia, Cahokia, French Village, and Prairie du Rocher." Every other part of the United States is exempt from the *Lex Clandestinitatis*, except that it is, with wily caution, provided that for every Catholic who erroneously believes the law of Trent to be in force where he marries it shall be in force. Such a man, so to speak, pulls it down on his own head. There is no part of our country in which marriages between baptized Protestants are held subject, for validity, to the law of Trent, unless it should be New Mexico and southern Colorado, as to which Rome has never given a final decision. As Protestantism there is recent, very possibly the severer school would declare even Protestants there bound by the *Lex Clandestinitatis*.

Mr. Gladstone affirms, in his pamphlets on Vaticanism, that should Rome proclaim the *Lex Clandestinitatis* in Great Britain she would be obliged to treat all subsequent Protestant marriages in the island as null and void. She would certainly not be so obliged; and the general trend of Roman Catholic theology in our time seems to be the other way. He overlooks the fact that the law of Trent comes into force, not by virtue of a national proclamation, but in each parish by virtue of a special publication. Were there accordingly ten thousand Roman Catholic parishes in Great Britain, the promulgation

of the *Lex Clandestinitatis* in nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine would leave the ten thousandth parish wholly unaffected and exempt. Moreover, according to the general tenor of Roman Catholic authorities, including even the Jesuits, Protestants are confessedly untouched by the *Lex Clandestinitatis* in countries where they enjoyed an organized and permitted worship before 1563, in countries which, though then Catholic, have since become so prevailingly Protestant that the law of Trent has long fallen out of use, even for Roman Catholics. Cardinal Newman, indeed, with other divines, denies that a Protestant couple is ever bound by the *Lex Clandestinitatis*; but in this he appears to have Jesuit authority and the trend of the Roman decisions against him, although the chief pontiff himself has never pronounced a conclusive judgment on this point. Pending such a final decision the Roman congregations of the council appear to take the view that, wherever in any region the law of Trent was not proclaimed until after the Protestants had an organized system of their own, still maintained, or where, having been proclaimed, it has fallen into disuse, Protestant marriages valid on other conditions are to be acknowledged; but that otherwise they are to go for naught. Accordingly, were Rome to-morrow to promulgate the law of Trent in every Roman Catholic parish north of the Channel, it may be safely assumed that this would not, from her point of view, affect the validity of Protestant marriages in the Protestant island. The Protestants, as the Jesuit Lehmkuhl remarks, being separated into societies of their own, cannot be regarded as members of the Catholic parishes in any such sense as that the promulgation can be juridically apprehended as made to them. Yet this, it is held, would not apply to Protestant societies formed, as now in Italy, Spain, Mexico, and Brazil, by secession from parishes already standing under the law of Trent. Protestant marriages, at least of natives, in all these countries, will doubtless be treated by the Roman Church as null and void, as being "filthy concubinages" in an aggravated degree.

The question may be raised whether a Roman Catholic clergyman is permitted to marry a Protestant or an unbaptized couple. It appears that he may, acting simply as a magistrate, without any *communicatio in sacris*—that is, without any reli-

gious rite. At least this may be permitted in the second case, if not in the first, as the unbaptized are not viewed as rebels against the Church, and the priest is therefore guilty of no complicity with rebellion in assisting them to enter into a relation which, though not sacramental, is esteemed wholly legitimate. Indeed, in this case he might possibly offer a prayer, though not impart a benediction. On the other hand, the Church treats it as a mortal sin for one of her children to use the services of an heretical clergyman either before, after, or without the ceremony of his own religion, at least where the religious rites of Protestantism are employed. She grudgingly tolerates his appearing before the Protestant minister, in cases of mixed marriage, where the heretical party insists upon it, provided it is agreed that there shall be no religious ceremony whatever, but that the Protestant clergyman shall act purely as a civil magistrate or legally accredited witness. Here, however, as we know, her children are in fact often very inattentive to her monitions, contenting themselves with some slight amends of confession and nominal penance.

What authority over marriage does the Roman Church attribute to the State? Over the marriages of the unbaptized she concedes an indefinite authority, claiming no jurisdiction over them for herself, so long as the parties remained unbaptized. Impediments of merely ecclesiastical enactment are acknowledged to have no application to them. But over the marriages of the baptized, Catholic, schismatical, or heretical, she claims complete and exclusive authority, leaving to the State only authority over the mere circumstances and fringes of the relation and its temporal consequences, such as the rights of succession and dower. It is certain, from express, peremptory, repeated, and recent declarations of the chief pontiffs, crowning a long series of papal and conciliar declarations, that the Roman Catholic Church maintains, not indeed as of faith, but as morally certain, that all marriages of the baptized, and especially all marriages between the baptized, as having been raised into the supernatural order, belong exclusively to her competence. She alone can impose invalidating impediments. She alone can remove them. She alone can determine a marriage to be valid and a subsequent marriage null, or null and the subsequent marriage valid. She alone can pronounce children legitimate

or illegitimate. These decisions of hers are of immediate civil efficacy, binding civil judges in conscience to act accordingly. The refusal of governments to accept them is an act of civil and spiritual rebellion. At most they can but suspend such sentences for appeal from a national church to the Church of Rome, whose decision, once given by the pope, is conclusive as to the case in hand. If the State, without contradicting the Church, adds new impediments, these may bind, by the fear of ill consequences, but not as intrinsically obligatory on the conscience. A Roman Catholic who contradicts any of these positions is not, indeed, excommunicated, but he is looked upon as of very doubtful Catholicity, a mere Gallican, only a few grades above a Protestant.

These various positions, avoiding minute particulars rather curious than important, all of them carefully tested by repeated collation of high authorities who have written within three centuries, especially of Archbishop Heiss, Lehmkuhl, Bellarmine, Cardinal Newman, the Catholic Dictionary, Wetzer and Welte's profoundly digested Encyclopedia, St. Alfonso de Liguori, that exceedingly mild and careful, but profoundly learned and very clear-minded pope, Benedict XIV, and manifold decisions of Roman congregations and popes, resting upon the definitions and enactments of Trent, give us the essential lines, so far as concerns us, upon which the Roman Catholic doctrine and law of marriage have settled down in our day. As we have said at the beginning, it will be seen that at various points of great moment the Roman doctrine comes very near to us, and that at other points of great moment it recedes very far from us. As respects the point of chief moment to us as Christians Rome acknowledges unhesitatingly that the overwhelming majority of marriages between baptized Protestants in the United States are valid, sacramental, and indissoluble.

Charles C. Starbuck

ART. IV.—SOME ASPECTS OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

THE origin and development of Christianity are preeminently the miracle of the ages. The history of the world exhibits no similar phenomenon. While there are many clearly discernible human elements in this growth there will always necessarily be a residuum, a subtle force, underlying the whole movement that cannot be explained from the purely human standpoint. The first Christians were makers, not writers, of history. They were more concerned to leave their mark upon the world in deeds than in words. Thus it is that the early records are so meager, and thus it comes to pass that the origin of Christianity has received so many different explanations. How often has the solution of this problem been attempted! Nevertheless historians and theologians, philosophers and psychologists, are still at work upon it, sifting the materials, scrutinizing the original documents, and trying to peer a little deeper into the minds that indited the various records yet extant, or into the circumstances that called each particular record into existence.

One of the latest works of the many bearing upon this topic, and certainly one of the best, if not the best, now in print is entitled *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidenthums*, by Victor Schultze, Professor in the University of Greifswald, 1887-92. Its two solid volumes, based almost entirely on original documents, apparently leave little more to be said on the subject of which they treat until additional materials shall be forthcoming. The author writes without a trace of warmth or enthusiasm. The deliberateness with which he reaches his conclusions and the judicial coldness with which he sets them forth carry conviction on almost every point. The view he takes of the motives of the early Christians and of the disinterested activity of the first converts is highly favorable. Even Constantine, whose conversion has often been characterized as a piece of statecraft and nothing more, is shown to have acted in sincerity and to have honestly believed what he professed. Let us glance rapidly over the first three Christian centuries, with special reference to the moral and social forces at work during this period.

Toward the end of the first century after Christ, Rome had

extended her sway until it was acknowledged almost without resistance over the civilized world. The utmost bounds of its power had been reached. The last formidable opposition, that of the Jews, had been overcome. An admirable system of highways had made intercommunication between the most remote parts of the country comparatively easy and rapid. This condition of things had not a little influence upon the spread of Christianity. A knowledge of the Greek language, especially in the East, seems to have been almost universal. The fact that the New Testament writings are all in this language is sufficient evidence of its universality. No doubt the dispersion of the early Christians from Palestine by devastating wars was greatly instrumental in the rapid spread of the new doctrine. While there is not much direct testimony as to the missionary labors of the first disciples, except Paul, the existence of many congregations in widely separated parts of the known world may be accepted as proof of the zeal and rapid multiplication of converts. The sway of the Roman government over so large an extent of territory was especially favorable to Christianity in one important particular. Not only was migration from one section of country to another made easy by military roads, but this system also served to break down any barriers that might be set up by one province against another. Ingress and egress were, doubtless, equally easy and safe.

Though the Roman empire was widely extended and nearly all its free subjects had become citizens, this class, nevertheless, embraced but a comparatively small portion of the entire population. It seems highly probable, however, that the condition of the slaves was in some respects preferable to that of a large number of the free citizens. In material regards they were not unfrequently better off, and the moral sentiment of the world had not yet become of sufficient weight against the institution of slavery to make its victims feel keenly the disgrace of their position. Nothing is more remarkable in the history of public opinion than the slowness of its development against what Wesley called the sum of villainies, unless it be the vehemence of that opinion when once it began to grow. We have no means of forming even an approximate estimate of the population of the Roman empire at this time. That it was greater than at the beginning of the fourth century

is probable, as war, pestilence, and famine, now in one region, now in another, doubtless made great havoc in the intervening period of two centuries. Several modern historians have estimated the number of people embraced within the civilized world when Christianity became the State religion. Schultze thinks it cannot have been far from one hundred millions, of which at least one tenth were nominally Christians, and about the same number Jews. Gibbon puts the number of Christians at five millions; Keim at more than three times this number. Most other authorities oscillate between these two extremes, with a general tendency toward the larger figures.

Before the advent of Christianity the barbarian element had virtually disappeared, especially in the East. Nowhere does it come to the surface. The Greeks were the predominant race, with a large admixture, though not intermixture, of Jews. It is safe to assume that neither were devoid of intelligence. It was not necessary, therefore, to create a civilization on which Christianity could be engrafted. As we penetrate further into the first Christian centuries the economic distress of the times becomes more and more apparent and pressing. But the majority of the people were too intelligent to resign themselves calmly to despair, like the Russian peasants of our day. Many were eager to enter upon any scheme that promised to better their temporal condition and to assist others who were most in need of aid. The feeling of kinship was stronger than it is in our day, though not the recognition of moral obligation to men as fellow-beings. The world was not indifferent to the practical teachings of peace and mutual help that Christianity brought to its attention. Hellenism was in one sense directly favorable to Christianity. The Greeks had no interest in the military projects of Rome, and their national character lacked the conservatism that was so marked a trait of the Romans. They held less tenaciously to customs and traditions simply because they were of immemorial usage. Besides, their lively curiosity made them ever ready to give heed to anything that promised to gratify it. The importance of this fact can be best appreciated by those who have had the opportunity or have taken the pains to study the Greeks as they are to-day. They are still, as they always have been, the progressive element among the people of the East. Greek literature

must at all times have been much read and studied. In some of its moral questions receive a large share of attention. Of the profane writers belonging to the first century of our era no one was probably better known than the kindly Plutarch. On many points he approaches the Christian view of the ethical relation that ought to exist between man and man. Judged by his writings he was eminently a good man according to the old order of things. Still, Plutarch was far from being a Christian. His virtues are ethnic rather than cosmopolitan. His moral writings display a certain narrowness of view, a lack of enthusiasm, that is in striking contrast with the books of the New Testament and their successors. Nevertheless, his writings were certainly not without their influence for good. Seneca, too, though a Roman, was thoroughly imbued with Greek ideas. It is well known that he has often been regarded as a Christian, though a close inspection of his life will show that this is a mistake. The works of these men and others more or less similar, together with the fact that they were popular, show that the world was to some extent ready to listen to those who endeavored to make men better. While these authors did not profess to teach philosophy, as the term is generally understood, they advocated a philosophy of living in which ethical principles occupied a prominent place.

The motives that led the first heathen to become Christians were without doubt of a somewhat varied character, though they may be classed under a few prominent heads. One of these motives grew out of the relation assumed to exist between gods and men. According to popular belief, the attitude of the former was supposed to be primarily one of hostility toward the latter. The good will of the gods had to be won by some means or other. It is true that many of the ancient philosophers held that these gods were unworthy the name if they looked with greater favor on the gifts of the rich than on those of the poor. But there is abundant evidence to prove that it was a matter of common belief that the good will of a god could in almost every instance be gained or his anger appeased by gifts of sufficient value. In the place of this somber faith Christianity taught the universal fatherhood of God, the only divine Being. It laid great stress upon the fact that his attitude toward man was primarily and constantly one of intense love; and

that not costly gifts, or, indeed, any gifts, were needed to gain his favor. In place of the capricious beings whose ill-will might be aroused by the most trifling act or omission, the heathen were told of a Being with whom there is no variability or shadow of turning, a Being who is just according to men's highest conceptions of justice, and whose character could be sufficiently comprehended by the humblest worshiper. The wide extension of the Greek language had done much to prepare the way for the spread of a cosmopolitan religion such as Christianity claimed to be. Still, this element of its character did not gain ascendancy without a struggle, as is evident from the conflict of views between the Jewish and the Gentile converts. The mighty personality of the greatest of the apostles eventually decided the contest and opened the way for the establishment of congregations throughout the known world. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man were the corner stones of the new religion. Yet it must not be supposed that either of these doctrines found ready and full acceptance even among the heathen, grateful as it must have been to the thousands who were without political rights, or at least without such as were of any value. Nor was the spirit of mutual help and brotherly kindness easy to understand in its practical aspects; but that it must have exercised a powerful influence upon many can readily be conceived even if it were not well attested. It no doubt brought some hypocrites into the Church of the sort typified in Ananias and Sapphira, but there is no evidence that they were numerous.

That the possessions of the Church are the property of the poor was the motto of believers from the least to the greatest. Christian writers never tire of contrasting the luxurious living of the heathen priests with the humble condition of their own spiritual leaders. They dwell with equal persistence on the dissolute lives of the former, whose sole object was sensual enjoyment, as contrasted with the charitable labors of the latter. The early bishops urgently insist upon the value of active philanthropy no less than upon the importance of a godly walk and conversation. Says Schultze:

An effectual means of gaining influence over the heathen lay in the activity of the Church in works and institutions of a social character. As early as the apostolic times we find the care of the

poor conducted voluntarily and systematically. Though intended primarily for believers, it extended beyond these in particular cases. In close relation with this activity was the solicitude of the Church for the sick, for the feeble of every age, for orphans, and for all who were in any way in need of help. These works of charity and mercy were carried on to an extent and with a zeal that sufficiently attest the existence of an admirably planned and widespread organization. Later on, when the material condition of the Roman empire kept going from bad to worse, it is easy to imagine how great an attraction upon the humbler classes such charitable organizations would exert as the Church had established, or had in charge. We do not know to what extent such institutions increased the number of believers, but we are safe in drawing the inference that it must have been considerable. On the other hand, we know positively that the Church rescued and brought up in the doctrines of Christianity large numbers of heathen children that had been cast forth to die. The immemorial usage of parents exposing those children who were likely to become a burden upon them was proscribed by the Christian emperors, but had not wholly ceased as late as the sixth century. The Church set itself resolutely against this heartless practice, and not only rescued the victims of parental cruelty from death, but saved many from physical and moral degradation.

What a potent factor in the building up of the Church the spirit of brotherly kindness must have been may be judged from the estimate put upon it by the emperor Julian, who wished to transplant it into his ideal commonwealth. To three things, he thought (Schultze, i, 164), Christianity owed its rapid growth: the active benevolence of its votaries, their care for the dead, and a godly walk and conversation. But he so greatly misunderstood the spirit of believers as to charge the last of these to pure hypocrisy. It is safe to accept his judgment upon the situation, though he misinterpreted the motive. He so far misconceived the spirit of believers as to suppose that such conduct could have sprung from, or be based on, the polytheism which they had discarded. To look for grapes on thorn-bushes would not have been a greater absurdity. It needs but a cursory examination of the vocabulary of the New Testament, and no profound knowledge of the Greek current in the time of Christ, to convince anyone that the two deal with widely different modes of thought and feeling. The first Christian writers had in a great measure to create the lexical material with which to express their ideas. This they did by assigning to current words a special, usually a wider, significance than they had

at the time. In no particular is the expansive power of Christianity more strikingly exhibited than in the influence it had upon the language in which its teachings were first promulgated. The skill with which the early disciples, in spite of the fact that some of them were men of meager education, adapted the old words to the new conditions, presents one of the most interesting phases in the development of the human mind.*

It is a sad fact that together with the recognition of Christianity as the State religion came its spiritual decline. Yet there is nothing surprising in this, or, rather, it follows from the nature of the case. As soon as it becomes a matter of material advantage to belong to a particular organization in which membership is a mere voluntary act, there will always be many to take advantage of their prerogative to whom the aims and purposes of the association are a matter of indifference. The history of Christianity for fifteen hundred years is a standing witness to the fact that the largest measure of spiritual life is found in those denominations that are without governmental recognition. Wherever there is a State Church it is assumed that all loyal citizens will be found among its members. A disorderly walk may bring rebuke upon the offender, but rarely, or never, expulsion. The English Church, to cite only this single example, was almost totally devoid of spiritual life during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Bishop Tillotson said that in his day a converted clergyman was hard to find. When one scrutinizes the life of the clergy whose duty it was to watch over the spiritual interests of their parishioners, it almost exceeds belief that those in episcopal authority would

*One reason why the apostles and evangelists employed the Greek language was undoubtedly its extensive use. But there was another in its favor, as compared with the Latin, which was also widely prevalent. It may seem strange that Paul wrote in Greek to the disciples at Rome, but this is, in part at least, explained by the presence in the imperial city of many persons from the East who were familiar with the language. The strongest argument in favor of Greek was, however, next to its practical value, the facility with which it lent itself to the discussion of metaphysical and doctrinal questions. There was no theme which could not be readily handled in this tongue. The new religion needed a new nomenclature; and this could be most readily formed from the Greek. There existed in it a body of philosophical writings that made the discrimination of mental phenomena a comparatively easy matter. If new compounds were needed they could be easily and naturally formed. No language in use would have served the purpose so well, or nearly so well, as the Greek.

connive at the reckless courses generally led by these so-called shepherds of the people. The advent of the English reformers in the early years of the eighteenth century, among whom John Wesley was easily the chief, produced a state of things and aroused a popular interest that had many points in common with the first Christian centuries. The parallel need not be carried out in detail here; every one can do that for himself. The power of the government, both active and passive, was against the new sect; yet it grew and prospered because spiritual forces contended in its behalf. Victor Hugo wisely says that a prince is nothing in the presence of a principle. "The best of all is, God is with us" was a conviction destined ultimately to overcome all opposition. And it will always be so.

Experience proves that it is better for the Church that its membership should remain in the minority. So long as it continues to be a truly spiritual body its influence will not be measured by its numbers. If, on the other hand, concessions are made to give it numerical strength, as has so often been done, the same results will always follow that have gone hand in hand with the growth of Christianity from the time of Constantine to our day. Humanly speaking, no doctrine was ever proclaimed that had so little probability of success in its favor as Christianity when it was first promulgated by the apostles. Many times has it been asserted that Greek philosophy was a propædæntic for Christianity. It is very doubtful whether this view is correct. Greek philosophy concerned itself, as all philosophy does, with the search after truth. Its votaries sought to know the reason of things. It had no deep interest in fallen and miserable men. It might, indeed, indicate the ways and means by which men might become better; but it concerned itself little with the practical needs of their case. Philosophy often inculcates resignation; it may even in special instances lead the way to personal improvement; but it rarely goes beyond this narrow sphere. Philosophy sometimes teaches morality; but men need a morality touched with emotion to move them. In its controversial aspects Greek philosophy was, doubtless, not without its influence on the doctrinal form of Christianity; but this had little to do with commending it to the masses. Then, too, most of the adherents of the later Greek philosophy, those who called themselves philosophers,

were men whose lives were little calculated to win respect for the doctrines they professed. It is well known that the Romans, long before the time of the empire, looked upon them and their professions with contempt. Their conduct was in general deserving of no milder judgment. Ready to undertake anything that promised a temporary livelihood, they were only consistent in their utter disregard of any fixed principles. There were, it is true, some notable and noble exceptions to this sweeping condemnation, but they do not seem to have been either numerous or influential. Nearly all the philosophical schools began by despising Christianity when they came in contact with it, and ended with bitterly denouncing it.

Kant has said that men need a God who interests himself in them, a God who is not a mere abstraction or a being who dwells afar off. Such a God was brought to the attention of men by Christianity after they had gone far toward losing all faith in their traditional divinities. Science, mere abstract knowledge, is cold and unsympathetic. It lacks the warm pulse of emotion. It is one thing to know, and another thing to do. When we are sick we seek the services of the wisest physician. But if he merely tells us how we became sick, lectures us on the laws of our physical nature that we have violated, and takes no further interest in us, his wisdom will profit us little then and there. We shall fare better in the hands of one who, with less knowledge, interests himself in our condition and is willing to do what he can to cure us. A faithful and devoted nurse is of far greater value to a sick man than the most skillful physician who is indifferent or who has only a theoretical interest in us. Greek philosophy was, figuratively speaking, the skillful physician. It could diagnose the pathological condition of the human soul; point out clearly the cause of its diseases; but it did and could do little more. On the other hand, Christianity was the faithful nurse, interested in the patient though not in the cause of his disease. This being the case, need we wonder to which of them men and women would most readily turn for relief? Still, there were many who clung to the old religion because it embodied the faith of their ancestors. They practiced its rites mechanically and gave the subject no further thought. Others vaguely imagined that the existing order of things somehow depended on the observance of certain times

honored ceremonies. Though some of these rites and ceremonies were gross and sensual in the highest degree, they were not objectionable to them on that account. To not a few persons these ceremonies may even have been a recommendation. Such a religion made no demands on the moral nature and left the worshiper to his own devices. It is sufficiently evident, from the writings of the apostle Paul, that even professing Christians were sometimes loath to give up wholly their idolatrous practices. To these they clung with a tenacity that may seem surprising. But it is not so when we look into the traditions and surroundings of the early converts.

It has often been said that the growth of Christianity, in its inception, was greatly accelerated by the decay of faith in the old gods. How far this was the case cannot be ascertained with any degree of accuracy. One thing, however, is certain—there is abundant evidence of the fact that the ancient rites at least were not interrupted. What Paul mildly commended in his address on Mars' Hill was deduced from wide observation. The Greeks were always careful in the external observances of religion. The apostles' experience at Ephesus showed the same state of things. Forms and ceremonies were still sedulously observed. The belief was widespread that in some way the regular course of nature was dependent upon them. The Christian apologists did not neglect to use the intellectual weapons that famine and pestilence put into their hands. They were fond of dwelling upon the emptiness of a faith in gods who deserted their votaries at the very time when most in need of their aid. When, then, it came to be more and more evident that the course of nature would not be interrupted with the cessation of the old rites, we may well believe that they fell into desuetude with increasing rapidity.

Christ was the first great teacher who insisted on the intimate connection between religion and morality. He would tolerate no divorce between them on the part of his disciples. No human beings have ever lived in a social state who were without a religion; there have been many, as there still are, who have only the faintest conception of practical morality. Not even the Greeks had to any considerable extent reconciled the relation existing between them. While many of the popular Greek maxims are not without moral import, they do not

bring the whole range of conduct within their sphere. The most advanced ethical doctrines of the Greeks exhibit conspicuous gaps that were filled up by Christianity. This aspect of the new doctrine certainly did not tend to make it rapidly popular, we may be sure, but it helped to make its growth steady and continuous. This connection between religion and morality is clearly foreshadowed in the Old Testament, and its rules of conduct are, perhaps, as rigorous as those of the New. Nevertheless many of its representative characters were guilty of base acts. There is an evident concession to the hardness of men's hearts, not made in Christian times. But every reader of the apostolic writings knows how constantly they insist upon the interrelation between creed and conduct.

There is a universal trait of human nature that pleads strongly for the maintenance of the ancestral modes of worship. Most men are averse to change. They shrink from the effort necessary to fit themselves into new conditions. This trait finds utterance in the familiar maxim, "Let well enough alone." The Roman empire had grown great under the tutelage of the ancestral gods. In the course of time it had come to recognize nearly or quite all the gods worshiped throughout its vast extent. Was it safe to discard them? Prudence said not. Though the condition of things might be in some degree unsatisfactory, would it be an improvement to venture upon radical innovations, most of all when these concerned so important a matter as the national religion? Prudence again uttered an emphatic "No." It is therefore not surprising that some of the best Roman emperors persecuted the Christians. The Roman religion was an integral part of the Roman State. The Eternal City was believed to have been founded under divine auspices. The empire was but an extension of the city, though it might embrace the known world. The obligation to see to it that the traditional religious rites were properly observed rested upon the magistrates as much as the discharge of their civil functions. The relation of the heads of families to the other members was similar, almost identical. The good father, the patriotic citizen, the conscientious public functionary, were all regarded as bound to pay careful heed to the will of the gods and to take proper measures for the due observance of long-established and regularly recurring religious rites. It is particularly true of the

later Roman commonwealth, beginning with the time when the republic began to verge toward the empire, that the mental attitude of the worshiper was regarded as a matter of entire indifference. We may well believe that in early Rome there were many whose worship of the gods was sincere. They were what we may call, by anticipation, genuinely pious. In the course of time, however, religion came to be regarded as a purely external matter. The gods were assumed to care nothing as to what the worshiper thought, provided he performed proper acts. Their favor was to be gained or their wrath appeased by the practice of mere perfunctory rites. While it may appear grotesque to us to see the commander of an army consulting and repeating auguries until the omens were favorable, this was frequently done; the Roman soldier failed to fight with his accustomed bravery only when this was omitted or when under the shadow of an unfavorable response. Such a repeated consultation of auguries would never fail to win over the gods to the side of the Romans; and this belief had undoubtedly much influence on the destiny of the Roman empire. It is always possible to cause a die to fall in any desired position if it be thrown often enough. This may occur at the first cast or it may require a dozen or even a hundred; but the desired result cannot fail. It was by similar methods that the Roman soothsayers invariably succeeded in procuring favorable omens. In view, then, of the entire lack of connection in the Roman mind between the subjective and the objective, between the faith of the worshiper and his act of worship, a patriotic citizen might be an infidel in religious belief and yet perform the traditional and customary rites with a certain measure of good faith. Refusal would readily be interpreted as a species of perversity bordering close upon treason, if it were not treason itself. There was no prohibition insisted on more rigorously by the early teachers of Christianity than abstention from every form of idolatry. The neophyte was required to make this renunciation first and foremost. Christianity was not a whit more tolerant of idolatry than was Judaism. The apostles foresaw with surprising clearness that a monotheistic creed was an indispensable condition to an upright life. Men must not be permitted to revere divinities who are capable both of committing and sanctioning immoral acts. It was an impos-

sible thing, an irreconcilable contradiction, that the same super-human being could approve deeds that had diametrically opposite ethical qualities. The same fountain could not send forth bitter waters and sweet. The same God could not incite men to noble and ignoble acts. Wickedness was not due to an impulse communicated from without; it was the consequence of an evil heart within. It was men's own lusts that enticed them from the path of rectitude, not the inspiration of Deity. There is one God in whom all men live and have their being, and he is only good. He has implanted in all men the power to discern the moral quality of actions; and even the heathen are without excuse if they persist in doing what is wrong. It was in the relation which idolatry held to the State that it first came into conflict with Christianity. Here was a vital point on which the early Christians were open to the attack of anyone who chose to make it. The Jews regarded idolatry with feelings akin to those of the Christians. They were, however, not a proselyting nation. They looked upon their relation to monotheism as a peculiar national birthright, not to be offered to any chance comer. Many of them were scattered throughout the cities of the Roman empire, and until the deification of the emperors became a maxim of statecraft and their worship part of the national religion, they were generally unmolested though despised. The times and circumstances that brought persecution upon the Christians brought it upon them also; but its greatest severity fell on the former. They were regarded as the more dangerous of the two because of their proselyting zeal. It was impossible to foretell the ultimate effects of this zeal, and the government at different times felt constrained to resort to repressive measures.

The stress laid by Jesus and the apostles on the doctrine of personal immortality is another salient point of contrast between Christians and unconverted Greeks. This doctrine found practical expression in the care constantly shown for the dead by the former. If there is to be a bodily resurrection the corpse of a believer must not be treated with neglect; it is worthy of the tenderest solicitude. In what way this solicitude was exercised is sufficiently attested by the contents of the catacombs, though this evidence at present exists chiefly in Europe. That it was general is well known. The Greeks had for the most

part a vague belief in immortality, but it afforded little consolation to those who were burdened with the cares of this world. It promised no compensations in a future existence for the privations endured in this. And it is worthy of remark that the Greeks of to-day have, in the main, advanced but little beyond the belief of their heathen ancestors. They still have a vague terror of the state beyond the grave. They have always been, as they still are, strongly disposed to make the most of the present life, because of the uncertainty of the future. They are no longer supported by the vigorous faith of the early converts among their countrymen. Christianity has become a matter of tradition, and has ceased to be a matter of personal conviction. "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die," has always been a popular maxim among them. It need hardly be said that this was a jejune creed for men whose earthly existence had but little to offer of that which they most desired.

We have thus rapidly sketched the salient points in the development of primitive Christianity. The general course of events is not hard to trace, and to the believer they offer nothing that is hard to comprehend. It is the growth of a divine religion constantly supported by the presence of the Holy Spirit. But to the materialist the case presents not a few serious difficulties. History furnishes no parallel to it. If any one had predicted in the year of our Lord 50 the triumphant course of a religion that had its origin among an insignificant and despised people he would have been derided as a madman or an enthusiastic dreamer. To suppose that the mightiest empire of the world could be conquered by spiritual weapons alone in the course of two centuries demanded a faith bordering on the sublime. Yet it was in this faith that the Church labored. What must have seemed to many an insane prediction was fulfilled. The worship of false gods was overthrown or continued a precarious existence in secret. The sad sequel to the touching story of the early years of Christianity is that, when it had gained the mastery over all opposition, it ceased to rely on spiritual weapons and resorted to force to secure the triumphs it had so gloriously won.

Chas. W. Super.

ART. V.—SOME CONDITIONS OF STYLE.

THE great writers on style in writing have left little to be said concerning principles; but there is one part of the subject where some important details are wanting. Let us preface by saying that there are two purposes to be served by good writing—utility and art. By the first is meant the imparting of ideas in the clearest and most effective way. It includes all but one of the effects of good writing, as, for example, conviction and persuasion. The one effect not necessarily included in a useful style is artistic effect. Most persons are content to forego the art, as most persons are indifferent to the other fine arts, are content that a building shall be useful, and see no charms in pictures or statues; and yet art has its divine place in human life and will always be cultivated for itself. The art of writing artistically so as to satisfy the æsthetic sense, as a painter satisfies it—the building of style up into architectural grace—has been chiefly cultivated by poets; but in this prose century of ours the fine art of expression in words finds cultivators among the prose writers and has given us prose marked by the essential features of the best poetry.

This kind of literary art in prose works upon materials such as the poets use, and its more various measures lend to its music a dignity and breadth not often found in any but the highest poets. The artistic prose must be seen in examples if the point here made is to be appreciated. Take, therefore, a few lines from Walter Pater, the greatest of our living prose artists:

Given the conditions I have tried to explain as constituting good art;—then if it be devoted further to the increase of men's happiness, to the redemption of the oppressed, or the enlargement of our sympathies with each other, or to such presentment of new or old truth about ourselves and our relation to the world as may ennoble and fortify us in our sojourn here, or immediately, as with Dante, to the glory of God, it will be also great art—if, over and above those qualities I summed up as mind and soul—that color and mystic perfume and that reasonable structure—it has something of the soul of humanity in it, and finds its logical, its architectural place, in the great structure of human life.

This sentence of one hundred and twenty-eight words, not one of which is a relative pronoun, is a piece of architecture as truly

as any sonnet is. It is not easy reading; the sentence is too closely packed with presentive words to be easily read; but lucidity and music flow through it. The sentence is the last one in Mr. Pater's article on "Style," printed in the *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1888. We reproduce it, not as an extraordinarily fine sentence, but rather as an example of prose handicraft and as an illustration of the special purpose of this essay.

We are now prepared to suggest some details of literary art. Just as the materials on a painter's palette must be thoroughly mixed, so the mechanical elements of the writer's art must be completely resolved and fused. The words in the sentence are no more like the sentence than crude paints are like a picture. Sentences are also pictures, and their value is given them by the double process of reducing the words to a species of fluidity in the mind and then molding them around the soul we have put into them. To drop figures: No man can be an artist in his style who cannot make a perfect analysis of his words. Of course, he must also have something to put into his sentences. Words may jingle and clang, but they will not play any noble tune. This analysis, this resolution of verbal materials into elementary condition, how is it accomplished? Or, rather, how shall one go about training himself in this handicraft part of his business? A light on the subject comes from the history of the best literary artists. They are invariably men trained by their education and by the habits of their lives to close and constant analysis of the elements of speech. They know the history of their words, the value of their particles, the metaphor fading off from them or developing in them, the trope to be forgotten all about, and the trope distinctly to be remembered; and no particle, in composition or working in single harness, is permitted to escape the molding hand of the master of the sentence. The answer to our question then is: the finished master in style is a product of much study and analysis of words. He must know to the bottom the material in which he works, as a potter works his clay or a painter his colors.

From fifty to sixty per cent of the words in a sentence are symbolic; that is to say, they present no distinct thing to the mind. With forty significant words the artist must combine sixty wanting distinct faces. The sixty are like the plus

and minus signs. Like them, they must be put in the right places, and, like them, must not be used at all in the wrong place or any place where they add nothing or subtract nothing. Much work, otherwise good, is spoiled by the useless *but, which, and, that, the, an*. The function of each of these particles being supplementary, like the tail of an animal, the artist will see to it that the appendage is both needful and proportional; he will get some usefulness out of his symbol. Nor is it a small matter that some particles are very much alive, as the demonstrative in "*that* man," and yet in other connections may have no life at all, as in "He said *that* he would come." Nine times in ten the artist leaves out the second *that*, not to imitate colloquial style, but to cut away dead flesh. Your *the* is a more various particle; it ranges through so much unobtrusive significance that only an artist's fine sense will manage it, as in

And to watch, as *the* little bird watches
When *the* falcon is in *the* air.

Each of these particles has a special value; and each is something more than a symbol. The relatives are the least manageable of the symbols still in use. Our fathers had some connectives of a worse temper, as *whenever* and *whosoever*. Close study of the best writing will show that the artist omits the relatives when he can, and relies upon flat connections, aided by careful adjustment of clauses; and sentences of considerable length are reared up into cathedral grace without the help of the scaffolding of relatives and other connectives. No small part of the difficulty made for us by our Saxon relatives comes of their ungainliness. The French relative is more comely, or, rather, there is less of it, and it admits of vocal and even visible shortening; while our *who, which, whose, and whom* are symbols occupying considerable space and tolerating very little abbreviation in utterance. They resist the common law of symbolic words, and stand almost alone in their revolt from the rule that such words lose in composition a considerable part of their volume of sound. They stretch their whole bulk across the vision, and the mind cannot find relief in a musical reduction of the space they fill. Most significant words are capable of music; *Wabash* is an example, when it is spoken in

Chicago, where much use has crushed it into fluency. Yet after centuries of use our relative forms retain their unmusical notes and refuse to part with the least portion of their volume. The word *that*, now very rarely used as a relative, is susceptible of lengthenings and shortenings for its several functions and for fine musical effects, in cadences especially; and the rare instances of its relative use by Walter Pater are a homage to its fluent nature.

These facts in the nature of our relatives as sound and as visible speech probably explain why, in the history of fine writing, the use of the relatives has pretty steadily declined. Johnson's *Rasselas* contains twice as many in each one thousand words as are found in an essay of Walter Pater; and of the two the *Rasselas* is the more obviously an attempt at artistic composition. Lord Macaulay, about midway in time, is also nearly midway in the proportion of his relatives. The three authors give us the last and best century of our prose literature; Pater's practice shows the last furlong gained in our progress.

For reasons suggested we should have been happier in our English style if we could have gone on using *that* with the freedom of the sixteenth century. Our English Bible shows us how wide this freedom had become when English had just attained to elegance in prose letters. On the other hand, the sixth and seventh verses of the last chapter of Solomon's Song are constructed in much the same order of architecture as the sentences of Walter Pater. We had to part with *that* as a relative because the poor little word, with its three classes of duties, was sadly overworked. Not even the variety of its sound-volume and its musical elegance could entitle it to so many appearances on each page as were assigned to it by De Foe, Johnson, and Burke. When meaner artists seized the pen the poor word was so frequently employed as to positively weary the reader. The economy introduced by the best writers has, in fact, relieved *that* of much service in its offices of conjunctive and demonstrative—to such an extent that there is a tendency to increase its now very limited use as a relative.

We come back to the conditions of style imposed by symbolic words. In a good style these symbols fill a considerable part of every line. Some of them, as we have seen, stubbornly

resist reduction of their volume. It is plain that this group should be used as rarely as possible. It is plain, also, that the more or less significant symbols require great attention to secure to them accuracy of use and position, to be attained to only by a large amount of practice. Good art makes the dumb sing. The feebly vocal symbols add their small notes to the larger voices of the presentive words; the stubbornly dumb words, if they must appear in the line, should somehow be concealed from full sight and enunciation. Bad styles commonly display badly chosen presentive words and incoherence in their sequences; but a style may still be bad after all these errors are corrected. The secret of good style, of the best style, of literary art, lies in the management of the symbolic elements found in written language.

Emotion, or what Walter Pater calls soul, in writing usually banishes the ill-favored and ill-sounding connectives from the sentence. Any one may test this by picking out the elevated passages of a great writer; and the best writing must be characterized by emotional elevation.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, likely reading "J. H. Sturges". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned in the lower right quadrant of the page.

ART. VI.—THE COMING HERO.

GREAT reformatations have small beginnings. The leaven of truth has a marvelous vitalizing effect. The truth in a single heart, setting an intellect on fire with the zeal of a righteous cause, transforms civilization. Truth, embodied in a great man as its exponent, is always the dawn of a better day. Such men are epochal characters in history. They are the prominent mountain peaks of humanity. As the servants of great principles they are resplendent with a divine light that penetrates centuries of gloom. We call such men reformers. With prophetic vision they anticipate the demands of the future; with a sublime courage they believe in the progress of the race and the inherent possibilities of man more than in the conservatism of the past. Such men, possessed with great principles to which humanity responds, startle the nations with their statements of truth and become great teachers and benefactors. We bow before such men of inherent dignity and moral worth and adore them as the world's heroes. Looking back over the past, we behold the political hero arising out of the condition of the age and giving men better government. Each nation has its Washington, whom it venerates and immortalizes. We adore the hero in scientific and philosophical achievement who has broadened our intellectual horizons, and the religious hero who, breaking the bondage of caste and superstition, brings man to a greater spiritual freedom. These have all been forerunners of a hero yet to come. I believe this last hero of the human race will come in the twentieth century and fully establish the brotherhood of man under the law of love. His greatness will consist in the fact that he is a great servant.

Gathered in an upper room in Jerusalem on the eve of the most stupendous and far-reaching events of the world's history are twelve men of divers temperament and training, engaged in conversation with Him who has since been recognized as the Teacher of the ages. They have been planning the establishment of a great kingdom upon far-reaching reformatory principles. They have learned many sublime truths from their marvelous Teacher, have beheld visions of peaceful conquest by the power of new ethical truths, and are expecting some great

event as they face a mysterious future. In the shadow of uncertainty caused by the predicted and approaching departure of the great Teacher they are about to recline around the table at the paschal supper to celebrate a feast which to them was both historical and prophetic. In the social conversation preceding this feast they grew enthusiastic, even wrangling over the question who should be greatest in the expected kingdom. In the midst of the momentary excitement the Master, whose very wisdom and inherent dignity has made him great in their estimation, lays aside his outer garment, girds himself with a towel, and proceeds to perform a menial service, a service usually performed by a hireling or slave. He washes the feet of the disciples, according to a custom performed before the evening meal. The impetuous spokesman of that select body of men—spokesman only by age and temperament—objects to this seeming sacrifice of dignity and revolts against this revolutionary act of the great Teacher. One glance from that benevolent face with the simple statements, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter," and "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me," silences the objector, and the beautiful lesson is continued by a remarkable explanation of a great truth which the world has been slow to reconcile.

This bold object lesson was the act of a reformer, and as such was revolutionary and subverted preexisting customs and notions. I am not surprised at Peter's protest. To him it seemed to be a servile act. It has taken the light and experience of nearly nineteen centuries to invest this act with its regal meaning. It is beginning to dawn on some minds that they can never rise so high as when they become great servants. In fact, the most honored men to-day have been such. Lincoln, Grant, Gladstone are striking examples among English-speaking people. What a contrast between these men and Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon! The world has had many ambitious, selfish heroes, whose genius flashed as a meteor across the world's horizon, leaving devastation, ruin, and bloodshed in their trail; while history recalls the deeds of but few benevolent, self-sacrificing heroes who have sought to exalt humanity by the investment of their lives in the defense of great principles. Yet the few have outlived in influence the many whose greatness was but gilded cruelty and selfishness; and

the few are crowned to-day in the world's thought as great benefactors.

The Philosopher and Philanthropist of Nazareth, in whom dwelt the fullness of the Godhead, was a great reformer whose statements of truth penetrated to the core of wrongs and customs which were hoary with age. The teachings and example of Jesus are making all things new, though the moral elevation has been slow; but in no age has his example been more potent nor his teachings more closely investigated with reference to present problems than at the close of this century. Dr. Peabody, Harvard's great preacher, in alluding to this beautiful example of Jesus in one of his sermons to the students, used the following language:

This act of Jesus established a new order of nobility—that of great servants. Before, greatness had for its aim and token the acquisition or appropriation of wealth, title, power, service, or whatever else might be the foremost object of desire; and the greatest man was he who could most efficiently make others tributary to himself. Since, true greatness has had for its aim and token self-privation, self-renunciation, the bestowment of all that one has and is, for the good of his fellow-men; and he is the greatest who has the largest and most affluent nature to spend and sacrifice for his race and the most fervent desire to coin his whole being into uses and services.

I accept this as a terse statement of the important lesson which the great Teacher sought to impart, and would emphasize it now. Yet human blindness and unlawful ambition have revolted against this new order of knighthood and sought greatness in the lower lines of selfishness. The failure has been great—great upon the dwarfed and unsatisfied individual, and great in afflictions and hardships upon the masses.

It is said that "coming events cast their shadows before." These shadows are the conditions of humanity which claim attention and demand adjustment. Some one always arises to solve those vexed problems, and the conditions of to-day are prophetic of the coming hero. What are these conditions that demand great servants and are preparing the way for their coming? The unrest and conflicts manifested in commercial and industrial relations, in the discussion of political and economic questions, and also in the realm of theology and sociology indicate that we are in a transition period. Problems on every

hand are presenting themselves for solution. Past legislation seems to be ineffectual, and fails to meet the new conditions. The golden cord of our national and individual prosperity seems to be broken. Things seem to have a chaotic tendency. Our ablest financiers are perplexed, and thinking men of every class are looking for a solution of the many-sided problems now arising in our civilization. Some of the conditions which indicate the coming hero may be frankly stated.

The first condition is a want of confidence on the part of the masses in the leadership of those who aspire to political positions of trust and power. Once political exaltation meant that the man was a patriot, and his greatest success was attained in protecting the people's interests. But the strife for leadership in recent years, with its attendant corruptions, together with the betrayal of great public interests by men who have used their preferment and power for selfish purposes, has broken the confidence of the masses. They are "at sea" between the great political parties. They know the methods of the caucus and the convention and distrust the leaders, so that politics has become largely the strife of demagogues and their "heelers" for public patronage. Men are in politics for the money there is in it, and the big plums go to the men who have the largest bank accounts. The people are growing tired of this state of affairs, and are looking for great servants whose patriotism is unquestioned and whose lives will be invested in the service of pure government, based upon equity and justice to all classes. The handwriting is on the wall; the selfish politician is doomed, and the unrest of the masses means the coming hero—the great servant of the people's interests. The political methods of the last twenty-five years are failing. In the coming century the way to a throne will be along the line of patriotic and benevolent public service.

Again, the tyranny of wealth is disintegrating our social compact and breeding the elements of the commune. Nearly every town has its Shylock, who lives by his unjust extortions and upon unlawful interest, and who chafes because all men will not come under his thumb of oppression. The masses feel, perhaps unjustly, in some cases, that great wealth has been wrongfully gained and that in the prosperity of the last thirty years there has not been a fair distribution of the products of

capital and labor. During these years there has been but little legislation which has given full protection to the meager investments of the poor man in great corporations. He has not been permitted to have a place on the bottom floor of great industrial institutions. With no national comptroller to look into the affairs of industrial corporations and protect the small investors, such as is provided for by our laws in our national banking institutions, the poor man has been "frozen out," crowded to the wall, and is now dependent on these corporations and manufacturing institutions for a place to work, and upon wages alone. The age of steam and machinery has greatly hastened our civilization, but not without some disadvantages—disadvantages which ought not to exist and which are preparing the way for the coming hero. The industry of the world has been carried on under three systems: first, that of slavery; second, the feudal system, and, third, the wage system of the present age. It has been an upward progress, and the last stage is the best, recognizing, as it does, skill and intelligence. Yet the wage system as administered to-day is unsatisfactory. The masses resist the tendency toward dependence upon, or slavery to, great corporations. Labor organizations are but the exponents of this unrest. Here is a great problem for solution. The very conditions of this problem are prophetic of the coming hero, who, as a great servant, and upon the ethical principles of the golden rule, will find the solution, and when this is found and recognized we shall be in the dawn of the golden age of the highest individual freedom.

Again, in our larger cities and in many of our smaller ones the social cliques, based solely on wealth and diamonds—no other passport being required—are demoralizing public sentiment on many lines, debauching the public conscience in the awful haste to get rich, and alienating and destroying the brotherhood of man. There are places in this land where nothing less than one million dollars will admit a man to the social set. Brains, literary attainment, inventive genius, or great public services, none of these things equals wealth in the social estimation of our wealthy aristocracy, who ape an effete and degenerating royalty on other shores. The effect of this is injurious to our social compact, tends toward caste, builds up a hatred among the classes, and breaks that mutual depend-

ence that naturally exists between the capitalist and his skilled laborer. The social attitude of wealth has had much to do with the labor troubles of the last decade. Wealth means great responsibility, and should involve efficient stewardship in the discharge of public benefactions; but the general tendency, with but a few exceptions, is in the opposite direction, toward the tyranny of selfishness and toward a pharisaical exclusiveness and isolation.

The conditions of party politics, the exactions of industrial corporations, and the social tendencies of wealth present a boundless problem—almost as boundless as this country as described by the impetuous Fourth of July orator who said that "America is bounded on the north by the aurora borealis; on the east by the history of the past; on the south by the torrid zone, and on the west by the day of judgment!" Who shall appear to solve this problem, assume leadership conferred by the masses, still the noisy elements, and usher in a reign of peace built upon the right relations of all men? Not the theorist, who deals with abstract principles and knows but little of the practical side of life. Not the political economist, who deals simply with the acquisition and distribution of wealth, and who explains all the ills of humanity by protection or free trade, or monometallism, or bimetallism, or the Ricardo rent theory. Political economy as taught to-day from the books is on the rim of this great problem, and must go deeper and carry with it ethical principles to find the secret of a correct and peaceful solution.

The solution of the problem is not with the anarchist, who would level all things with torch and dynamite; nor with the socialist, who seeks by the ballot to make a community of goods; nor with the walking delegate of labor organizations, whose chief business is agitation. All these elements of discussion and interest are the indications and conditions of the coming hero who will give the world the solution and lead in the readjustment of a social compact based upon the brotherhood of man. His coming will be peaceable, it is to be hoped, because of the adherence of a free and sovereign people to his teachings; yet he may come while we are on the verge of chaos and in the midst of flaming torches and booming cannons, and out of the destruction and bloodshed make all things

new by ethical principles which shall shape and direct the application of economic principles.

It is now time to inquire after the characteristics of this coming hero, that we may recognize him when he does appear and hail him as the great servant of the twentieth century. I am sure he will be a noble man physically, intellectually, and morally. He will know himself, and all the active principles of his nature will be under perfect self-control, all working harmoniously together to exalt the supreme end of man. The body will be the servant of the mind, the mind the servant of the moral and spiritual natures, and the whole man radiant with nobility of character because he recognizes and obeys the laws of nature, heeds the voice of an enlightened conscience, and exemplifies the ethics of love in his conduct. His nobleness of character will not be spasmodic and made to order, but will be the outgrowth of his faith—faith in well-accepted philosophic principles, faith in the possibilities of human nature, faith in the ultimate triumph of right and truth, and faith in the ethics of the golden rule and the brotherhood of man. He will live not for self, but for others, and for the good he can do as a great servant. Stability of character will be a dominant trait of the coming hero, because he will be a man of convictions, and also have the courage of his convictions—not one thing to-day and something else to-morrow, in order to catch the popular favor. He will be a stable man. No one will doubt his consistency or question his manly convictions. His stability, like the rest of his character, will be the outgrowth of his belief in life's invisible forces. He will know that the visible things of this life are temporal and that the unseen forces are eternal. He will, therefore, anchor himself to the spirit forces of the universe, and, taking advantage of these forces as seen in gravity, in the passing breeze, in the sunbeam, in the electric current, in man's soul and in God's eternal presence and power, he will serve humanity as its last and greatest hero. The multitude will follow him because of his sincerity and disinterested benevolence. He will mold public opinion, and, by the voice of the people, he will be society's blessed lawgiver and benefactor.


He will be an American patriot. The love of good and equitable laws, the welfare of men in harmonious social relations and public morals, will be dear to his heart. His patriot-

ism will be on the investment principle. He will save others by the sacrifice of himself and his own interest. In short, he will be the world's greatest public servant. He may be a rich man. If so he will not hesitate to wash the poor man's feet. He may be a poor man; but as a leader of the masses he will make many rich by a new order of things in the industrial world and by inculcating a better state of social and public morals. He will be a Christian statesman. The ethics of the New Testament will be his guide in solving the difficulties of the new economic questions and in directing the affairs of the State, national as well as international. The ethics of Him who has been the world's greatest servant will furnish this coming statesman with correct sociological views, expressed in wise legislative enactments, which shall give new peace and harmonious relations to society. As a statesman, the product of new conditions in civilization, he will rise above the party blindness and selfish ambitions which characterize the vast majority of public men to-day. Imbued with the spirit and life of Jesus Christ, he will ascend to a broad view of American conditions and become the statesman of the twentieth century. This hero will not announce himself. He will doubtless be unconscious of his mission until near the close of his life. Perhaps the laurel wreath will never be placed upon his brow but rather placed on his statue by grateful generations. He will be crowded into leadership by the masses, and so absorbed will he be in the solution of the problems of the hour and in serving the people's interests on the platform of American patriotism that he will be unconscious of the greatness and permanency of his lifework. Therefore we need to beware of the man who announces himself as the hero of the age and calls upon a restless humanity to do him homage before he has solved the difficulties of our present civilization.

But the reader objects, and says that I have portrayed an imaginary character—a hero who cannot arise out of selfish humanity as now constituted. Such a view, I apprehend, is pessimistic, and leaves God and his purposes out of the question. The forces are now at work to produce this hero. The storm clouds on our national horizon, illustrated in Governor Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists at Chicago as a bid for the votes of foreigners of the socialistic class; the manipulations of a foreign

political Church, who will doubtless soon ask that the pope's nuncio be recognized at Washington; the flagrant disregard of the wishes of the American people touching the sacredness of the Sabbath day by a covetous city and a still more selfish local management of the World's Fair—these are the forces demanding a hero and an American statesman. These danger signals, together with many other economic and social forces, are now at work to produce a hero, and the world is waiting for his coming and the very age is expectant.

Who shall develop this hero? From whence shall he come? Out of adversity, doubtless; a poor boy, perhaps, trained as was the "rail-splitter" by bitter experiences that he might be a nation's saviour in its darkest hour. No matter whence he comes, one thing is sure: in order to meet the conditions of the next century he must come through the college and our institutions of higher learning into those broad scientific and philosophical views which shall enable him accurately to grasp the conditions of the age. He must also come through the universal Christian Church, whose central theology is the life and spirit of Jesus Christ, into those broad ethical views which shall fully enable him to grasp the great facts of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This very culture of head and heart will enable him to solve the difficulties which are now arising under the new conditions of our civilization.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "A. A. Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "A" that extends under the first name.

ART. VII.—THE PAULINE EPISTLES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—PART II.

A VERY ancient account of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* has come down to us in the form of a letter of the church of Smyrna. Its date is uncertain; but it was probably written not long after the death of Polycarp, which, it will be remembered, is supposed to have occurred A. D. 155. This letter is thought to have some spurious additions, but to be in the main a genuine document. In § 1 there is a quotation from Phil. ii, 4, and in § 2 Paul's version of Isa. lxiv, 4, is given very nearly as it stands in 1 Cor. ii, 9. In § 10 there seems to be a reference to Rom. xiii, 1, and to Titus iii, 1.

The *Epistle of Barnabas* is among the earliest Christian writings extant. Its date and authorship are uncertain; but it is generally agreed that it must have been written between A. D. 71 and 125. The writer appears to use Paul's epistles, but his references to them are not so pointed as to be very decisive. In § 13 Abraham is spoken of as a "father of the nations who believe, though they be in uncircumcision," recalling Rom. iv, 11. In § 19 there occurs what may be an echo of Gal. vi, 6. In § 6, "The habitation of our heart is a holy temple to the Lord," appears to be a reminiscence of Eph. ii, 21, 22. "A holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God;" and perhaps also of 1 Cor. iii, 16. "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God?" In § 12, "Jesus, for in him and to him are all things," resembles Col. i, 16, "All things have been created through him and unto him." There are seeming echoes of passages in 1 and 2 Thessalonians. The expression, in § 6, "He was about to be manifested . . . in the flesh," may be a reminiscence of 1 Tim. iii, 16, "He who was manifested in the flesh." "The Lord . . . who shall judge the quick and the dead" (§ 7) is the same phrase as is found in 2 Tim. iv, 1. On the whole, the allusions, such as they are, seem to be as much to the disputed as to the undisputed epistles.

In considering the testimony of Ignatius we meet with a very complicated and long-debated question. The letters of Ignatius to the churches and to Polycarp were written as he was on his way from Antioch to Rome, where he was to suffer

martyrdom under Trajan, probably, as already stated, "within a few years of A. D. 110." The letters, however, have come down to us in several different forms, and it has been questioned whether we have the real letters at all. Volumes have been written on the subject. The seven letters of the shorter Greek recension—those of the Middle Form, sometimes styled the Vossian letters—are defended as genuine by many very eminent scholars, such as Zahn, Harnack, Funk, Lipsius, Lightfoot, and others. On the other hand, some scholars still stand with Lardner, who said of this vexed question more than a century ago: "Whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question. . . . It appears to me probable that they are for the main the genuine epistles of Ignatius." But he adds, "Even the smaller epistles [that is, those of the Middle Form] may have been tampered with."* So also Charteris: "The point upon which we are not sure is the survival of those letters to our day in such a form that they can be used as evidence."† The value of the testimony of Ignatius may therefore be variously estimated by different persons. Let us now see what the testimony is, using the letters of the Middle Form.

Here, again, there is no express quotation from the books of the New Testament, but evident marks of acquaintance with both the gospels and the epistles. Ignatius, in his letter to the Ephesians (§ 12), says, "Ye are associates in the mysteries with Paul, who was sanctified, . . . who in every letter [or, in all his letter] makes mention of you in Christ Jesus." Some authorities, as Lardner, Ellicott, and others, think that this is a direct reference to Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Others, as Zahn and Lightfoot, think it refers rather to Paul's comments on the Ephesians in his letters to the Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and 1 and 2 Timothy. According to the former view Ignatius bears witness to the Epistle to the Ephesians; according to the latter view, to several of Paul's letters. Among the examples of the use of Paul's writings by Ignatius is the coincidence of the phrase, "newness of life," in Ig. Eph., § 19, with Rom. vi, 4. More marked is the resemblance between Rom. i, 3, 4, and Ig. Smyr., § 1, "Of the race of David according to the

* Lardner's *Works*, vol. ii, pp. 76, 77. London, 1838.

† A. H. Charteris, *Canonicity*, p. xxviii. 1880.

flesh, but Son of God by the divine will and power." The phrase, "Shall not inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. vi, 9, and Gal. v, 21, is used in Ig. Eph., § 16, and, slightly varied, in Ig. Phil., § 3. Also the words, "Yet am I not hereby justified," 1 Cor. iv, 4, are used in Ig. Rom., § 5. There seems to be evident allusion to 1 Cor. i, 20, in Ig. Eph., § 18; also to 2 Cor. xi, 9, in Ig. Phil., § 6; to Gal. i, 1, in Ig. Phil., § 1; to Eph. v, 25, 29, in Ig. Polyc., § 5; and to Eph. vi, 11-17, in Ig. Polyc., § 6. Compare also Ig. Eph., § 1, "imitators of God," and Eph. v, 1. Ig. Eph., § 9, echoes Eph. ii, 20-22. Ig. Mag., § 7, paraphrases Eph. iv, 3-6. Ig. Phil., § 8, "Do nothing through faction," is a reference to Phil. ii, 3; and in § 1 Ignatius uses the latter part of the same passage from Paul, "Nor yet through vainglory." Ig. Smyr., § 11, "As many as be perfect, be perfectly minded," is an allusion probably to Phil. iii, 15. Ig. Eph., § 10, "Steadfast in the faith," seems to allude to Col. i, 23. 1 Thess. v, 17, and 1 Tim. ii, 1, are reproduced in Ig. Eph., § 10, and Ig. Polyc., § 1. "Ye refreshed me in all things, and Jesus Christ shall refresh you. . . . May my spirit be for you and my bonds, which ye have not despised or been ashamed of; nor shall Jesus Christ . . . be ashamed of you," Ig. Smyr., §§ 9, 10, seems to be a recalling of 2 Tim. i, 16, 18. To all of Paul's epistles, in fact, except to 2 Thessalonians, even to that to Philemon, there are allusions more or less distinct. Those to 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, and Titus, however, are less marked than the others; those to 1 Corinthians and to Ephesians are the most pointed.

The *Didache* is a work whose date is uncertain. But many scholars assign it to a very early period—the latter part of the first century or the first part of the second century. It contains no precise quotation from Paul's epistles, but it is thought to allude to some of them. Harnack notices, for example, resemblances in Did. iv, §§ 10, 11, to Eph. vi, 5, 9, and Col. iii, 22; also in Did. xvi, § 4, to 2 Thess. ii, 1-12; and other verbal coincidences. Schaff, Lightfoot, and others trace resemblances which indicate probable use of Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians.*

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is an early fictitious

* Philip Schaff, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 92 and note, also p. 92. London, 1885.

work, purporting to give, in dying utterances of the sons of Jacob, moral and religious counsels and predictions of future history, especially of the events of Christianity. It was probably written by a Jewish Christian with the purpose of recommending Christianity to the Jews; and it, too, dates from near the close of the first century or the early part of the second century.* The writer, therefore, is as early a witness as the apostolic fathers, but a witness of a different type, in that he gives the testimony of Jewish Christians. As the *Testaments* purport to be words uttered before even our Old Testament was written, one should not look for quotations as such from the biblical books. Yet all the more striking, on this account, are the evident traces in it of the New Testament, which underlies its thought and crops out in its expressions. Professor Warfield has noticed that the writer makes use of thirty-nine words peculiar to Paul alone and found in no other Christian writer of his age; whereas only eleven are noted as peculiar to Paul and Clement of Rome, and only six peculiar to Paul and Polycarp. The greater length of the *Testaments* is not sufficient alone to account for this great difference.† In Levi, § 6, there is a clear borrowing from 1 Thess. ii, 16, in the words, "But the wrath of the Lord came suddenly upon them to the uttermost." Besides this passage many striking minor resemblances have been pointed out by Sinker,‡ Warfield, and others. Among them are the following: Ash., § 4, comp. Rom. ii, 13; Levi, § 3, comp. Rom. xii, 1; Benj., § 4, comp. Rom. xii, 21; Dan, § 5, comp. Rom. xv, 33; Gad, § 5, comp. 2 Cor. vii, 10; Benj., § 3, comp. Eph. ii, 2; Jud., § 14, comp. Eph. v, 18; Dan, § 5, also Reub., § 6, comp. Eph. iv, 25, 26; Naph., § 3, comp. Eph. v, 6; Benj., § 10, also Zeb., § 9, comp. Phil. ii, 6, ff.; Levi, § 14, comp. Phil. ii, 15; Levi, § 3, comp. Col. i, 16; Reub., § 6, comp. 1 Tim. i, 17; Dan, § 6, comp. 1 Tim. ii, 5; and Levi, § 8, comp. 2 Tim. iv, 8. The writer represents the dying Benjamin (§ 11) as thus prophesying of Paul, who was of the tribe

* Opinions concerning its date are the following: Dorner, A. D. 100-135; Wieseler, 100-120; Ewald, 90-100; Lightfoot, certainly after 70, probably before 135, "but may be later" (*Com. on Gal.*, p. 300); Sinker, "from late in the first century to the revolt of Bar-cochba" (A. D. 135); Warfield, 100-120.

† See *Presbyterian Review*, January, 1880, pp. 63, 64.

‡ Robert Sinker: *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Cambridge, 1869.

of Benjamin (Rom. xi, 1; Phil. iii, 5): "And one shall rise up from my seed in the latter times, beloved of the Lord, hearing upon the earth his voice, enlightening with new knowledge all the Gentiles, . . . and he shall be inscribed in the holy books, both his work and his word, and he shall be a chosen one of God forever." In the *Testaments* traces of acquaintance with all of Paul's epistles are thought to be discerned, except 2 Thessalonians and Philemon. But the use of 1 Corinthians and of Galatians is doubtful, and the allusions to Colossians and to Titus are faint. The most decided references are those to 1 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Romans, and Philippians; less marked are those to 2 Corinthians and 1 and 2 Timothy.

The *Epistle to Diognetus* is a work whose origin is hidden in obscurity. We have it; but we have neither date nor author nor attestation of it. It came down to us in but one manuscript, and that one now no longer exists, having been burned at Strassburg in 1870. Yet whoever reads the letter will agree with Semisch, that it is "a gem of Christian antiquity, which in spirit and style is scarcely equaled by any other writing of the sub-apostolic times."* From the contents of the letter scholars are generally agreed that the last two chapters are not by the author of the rest of the epistle. But in the effort to determine its date they differ so widely that the letter cannot confidently be cited as a witness of the first two centuries. Like the letter of Polycarp, it contains in proportion to its length a great number of passages and phrases apparently borrowed from Paul. The writer makes use of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and 1 Timothy.

The *Apology of Aristides* was addressed either to Hadrian or to Antoninus Pius, and its date probably lies between A. D. 125 and 140. Until very recently it was thought to be lost; but in 1889 a Syriac translation of it in a manuscript of the seventh century was discovered by Professor J. Rendel Harris in the convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. A fragment of an Armenian translation of it had in 1876 been published by the monks of the Lazarist monastery at Venice. Just as Professor Harris was about to give to the world the results of his discovery Mr. J. Armitage Robinson, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, who had read the proof-sheets of Mr. Harris's

* Herzog and Plitt, *Real-Encyclopädie*, Bd. iii, p. 611. Leipzig, 1878.

work, detected that the *Apology* coincided substantially with a speech incorporated into the *Life of Barlaam and Josaphat*, and thus that it was already extant in the Greek language, in which Aristides originally wrote it. The story of Barlaam and Josaphat had, before the thirteenth century, been translated into various languages, and the Greek text of it was published by Boissonade, in Paris, in 1832. Since the recent interesting discoveries of Messrs. Harris and Robinson the *Apology*, both in Syriac and in Greek, has been published by them.* There is some doubt whether the *Apology* was addressed to Hadrian. In the *Apology* there are, according to Mr. Robinson, "no direct quotations from the New Testament, although the apologist's diction is undoubtedly colored at times by the language of the apostolic writers." Instances of this sort from Paul's epistles are: Apol. i, comp. Col. i, 17; Apol. iii, comp. Rom. i, 25; Apol. viii, comp. Rom. i, 22; Apol. xi, comp. Rom. vii, 8; Apol. xiii, comp. Rom. vii, 12, 16, and 1 Tim. i, 8; Apol. xv, comp. 1 Thess. v, 18; and Apol. xvi, comp. 1 Thess. ii, 13. There are two or three other possible echoes of passages in Romans, 1 Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy. Thus Aristides appears to have been acquainted with at least Romans, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy.

Justin Martyr's *Apologies* and his *Dialogue with Trypho* are admitted to be genuine works, dating from about A. D. 140–150. The *Apologies* were addressed to a heathen emperor, and the dialogue is with a Jew; consequently quotations from the New Testament are not to be looked for in great number. Yet there are many passages which show incidental correspondence with Paul's epistles. Zahn and others point out resemblances and coincidences between Justin's writings and the epistles to the Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and 2 Thessalonians. Westcott says: "He appears to show traces of the influence of all St. Paul's epistles, with the exception of the pastoral epistles and those to the Philippians and Philemon."† Zahn, however, excepts likewise 2 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians.‡

* *Texts and Studies*, vol. i, No. 1. Cambridge, 1891.

† B. F. Westcott: *The Canon of the New Testament*, p. 171. 5th ed., 1881.

‡ Theodor Zahn: *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. i, p. 565. Leipzig, 1889.

Zahn, Westcott, and others draw attention to the remarkable coincidence between his variations from the Septuagint and those of Paul. Some examples of this are the following: Dial., § 24, comp. Isa. lxv, 1-3, and Rom. x, 20, 21; Dial., § 27, comp. Rom. iii, 10-18 (here Paul has strung together various passages from the Old Testament, and Justin has in the main followed him); Dial., § 39, comp. 1 Kings xix, 14, 18, and Rom. xi, 3, 4 (here Justin's "'Lord, they have slain thy prophets and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.' And he answers him, 'I have still seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to Baal,'" is condensed and transposed from the Septuagint like Paul's); Dial., § 39, comp. Psalm lxviii, 18, and Eph. iv, 8 (in rendering the passage "Gave gifts unto men," Justin follows Paul); and Dial., § 95, comp. Deut. xxvii, 26, and Gal. iii, 10, in connection with Dial., § 96, comp. Deut. xxi, 23, and Gal. iii, 13 (where the two passages are cited and applied as Paul uses them). A few fragments of Justin's lost works have been preserved in the writings of others. One of these has come down to us through Photius, who lived in the ninth century, and is found in his writings in connection with a fragment of a work on the resurrection by Methodius, who lived early in the fourth century. This fragment from Justin is interesting because in it he mentions Paul by name and clearly refers to 1 Cor. xv, 53-56.*

There is an ancient *Homily*, by an unknown author, which used to be ascribed to Clement of Rome and was often called his second epistle, although even Eusebius seems to have questioned whether Clement wrote it. But since the discoveries, in 1875, of the Greek manuscript and, in 1876, of the Syriac manuscript of this entire work there is no longer any doubt that it is a homily, and not by Clement, though by whom remains unknown. As to its date Funk conjectures that it was written rather before than after the middle of the second century; † Zahn, before A. D. 130; ‡ Gebhardt and Harnack, 130-160; § Uhlhorn, not later than 160; ¶ Lightfoot, about

* Theodor Zahn: *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. i, p. 575. 1889.

† *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, vol. i, pp. xxxviii, xxxix. 1881.

‡ *Geschichte*, etc., vol. i, p. 463.

§ *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera: Clem. Rom. Ep. Prolog.*, p. lxxiii.

¶ Herzog and Plitt: *Real-Encyclopädie*, article, *Clemens von Rom*.

120-140.* Both Lightfoot and Charteris speak of its mode of quoting Scripture as an evidence that it is of earlier date than the last quarter of the second century. There are in it two plain instances of borrowing from Paul. In § 14 the author says, "I do not suppose ye are ignorant that the living Church is the body of Christ;" and he goes on to draw out the comparison, speaking of this as what "the books and the apostles plainly declare," referring, doubtless, to Paul's repeated use of this figure, as in Eph. i, 22, 23, "The Church, which is his body," in Eph. iv, 12, "The building up of the body of Christ," in Col. i, 18, "He is the head of the body, the Church," and elsewhere. Again, § 19, "We are darkened in our understanding by our vain lusts," is a quotation from Eph. iv, 17, 18, "As the Gentiles also walk, in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding." Besides these more pointed references, which, it should be noticed, are especially to "disputed" epistles, there are other reminiscences and reflections of Paul's letters. A few may be noted. Compare § 1 and Rom. iv, 17. § 8 is a borrowing of Paul's figure of the clay in the hands of the potter, Rom. ix, 20, 21. In §§ 11, 14 there are echoes of 1 Cor. ii, 9. § 9, "We ought to guard the flesh as a temple of God," recalls 1 Cor. iii, 16, "Ye are a temple of God," and 1 Cor. vi, 19, "Your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost." § 7 paraphrases 1 Cor. ix, 24, 25. § 13, "Let us not be found men-pleasers," shows a verbal coincidence with Eph. vi, 6, and Col. iii, 22. § 20, "To the only God invisible," is an echo of "The King . . . invisible, the only God," 1 Tim. i, 17. Two similar turns of expression in §§ 15, 19 are perhaps suggested by, "Thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee," 1 Tim. iv, 16. § 12, "We know the day of God's appearing," resembles expressions in 1 and 2 Timothy and in Titus. Thus there are in the *Homily* traces of Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, and 1 Timothy. There are, perhaps, echoes of Galatians, 2 Timothy, and Titus.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* is an allegorical and mystical work of uncertain authorship, and dating probably between A. D. 130 and 150. It contains no quotation from either the Old or the New Testament. Charteris and Westcott notice one passage in 1 Corinthians, and two in Ephesians, which are perhaps

* *Apostolic Fathers: Clement of Rome*, vol. ii, p. 202.

alluded to in Hermas. Funk and, also, Gebhardt and Harnack notice other passages which are possibly echoes of Paul; but they are vague.

Tatian wrote his *Address to the Greeks* about A. D. 150 or 160. In it there are reflections of passages in Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and 1 Timothy. Instances are the following: Chap. iv, "Him we know from his creation and apprehend his invisible power by his works," comp. Rom. i, 20; chap. xv, "Such is the nature of man's constitution; and if it be a temple God is pleased to dwell in it by the Spirit, his representative," comp. 1 Cor. iii, 16, and vi, 19; chap. xvi, "Being armed with the breastplate of the celestial spirit," comp. Eph. vi, 14, 17, "Breastplate of righteousness . . . sword of the Spirit;" and chap. xx, "The heavens . . . have perpetual day and light unapproachable," comp. 1 Tim. vi, 16, "Dwelling in light unapproachable" (the adjective "unapproachable," a rare word, is the same in both passages). Jerome says that, although Tatian rejected some of Paul's epistles, he yet believed that the one to Titus was by that apostle.*

Melito of Sardis wrote, about A. D. 170, an apology addressed to Marcus Aurelius, of which we have a fragment that shows apparent use of 1 Cor. i, 24, and of 1 Thess. iv, 15.

Of the works of Dionysius of Corinth there are only a few fragments preserved to us in the writings of Eusebius. They were written not far from A. D. 170. In one fragment (Euseb., *Historia Ecclesiæ*, iv) is an adoption of the phrase, "As an affectionate father exhorting his children," from 1 Thess. ii, 11.

A few fragments from Hegesippus have likewise been preserved by Eusebius and by Photius. They date from about A. D. 170. Some, however, assign a later date as the more probable.† These fragments contain (Euseb., *Historia Ecclesiæ*, iii, 32) the phrase, "Science falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi, 20), and one or two other expressions which are thought to be echoes of the pastoral epistles. A fragment preserved by Photius (*Bibl.*, 232) gives the quotation of Isa. lxiv, 4, in a very similar form to that of Paul in 1 Cor. ii, 9.

Athenagoras of Athens is another of the ancient writers

* Præf. in *Comm. ad Titum*.

† George Salmon: *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 402. 3d ed., 1888. Salmon thinks that Hegesippus wrote "between 175 and 189."

whose history is obscure. Two works of his have come down to us, however, an *Apology for the Christians*, addressed to the Emperors Aurelian and Commodus, about A. D. 177, and a treatise on the resurrection. He uses the epistle to the Romans and the first to the Corinthians in his *Apology*, and there are besides perhaps allusions to Galatians and 1 Timothy. In *De Res.* 18 he cites from 1 Cor. xv, 54, as from "the apostle," combining with his quotation also one from 2 Cor. v, 10.

Theophilus of Antioch (died about A. D. 181) wrote the *Address to Autolycus* in three books, which we still have. His quotations from the New Testament are numerous and more explicit than those of the earlier writers, although he also often quotes from memory only. He distinctly quotes Rom. xiii, 7, 8, in Aut., iii, 14, and also 1 Tim. ii, 2, and introduces them as being from "the divine word." There are other passages which are plainly borrowed from Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, and Titus. But there is no distinct trace of the use of Galatians, 1 and 2 Thesalonians, 2 Timothy, or Philemon.

In this survey of evidence notice should also be taken of the testimony of the early heretical writers, fragments of whose works have been handed down to us in quotations from them made by Irenæus, Hippolytus, and others. Hippolytus, Hær. Ref., vi, 14, gives from the *Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη* of Simon Magus (it was more probably written by a disciple of his) a quotation of 1 Cor. xi, 32. Hip., Hær. Ref., v, 7, 8, cites the Ophites (about A. D. 100) as adducing, in support of their doctrines, Rom. i, 20-27; 1 Cor. ii, 13, 14; x, 11; 2 Cor. xii, 2-4 (quoted as from "Paul the apostle"); Gal. iii, 28 (combined with vi, 15); Eph. ii, 17; iii, 5; iii, 15; v, 14. Hip., Hær. Ref., v, 12, quotes the Peratæ as adducing in like manner 1 Cor. xi, 32; Col. i, 19 (combined with ii, 9). Hip., Hær. Ref., v, 19, gives as from the Sethiani an exact quotation of Phil. ii, 6, 7. Basilides, who flourished about A. D. 117-138, quotes, according to Hip., Hær. Ref., vii, 25-27, the following passages: Rom. v, 13, 14; viii, 19-22; 1 Cor. ii, 13; 2 Cor. xii, 4; Eph. i, 21; iii, 3; Col. i, 26 (comp. Eph. iii, 5, 9, 10, and Rom. xvi, 25). Valentinus (about A. D. 140) and his followers are quoted by Hip., Hær. Ref., vi, 34, 35, as using Rom. viii, 11; 1 Cor. ii, 14; Eph. iii, 14,

16-18; Col. i, 26 (comp. Eph. iii, 5, 9, 10, and Rom. xvi, 25); also by Irenæus, i, 3, as using 1 Cor. i, 18; Gal. vi, 14; Eph. iii, 21; and as grouping together, as utterances of Paul, Col. iii, 11; Rom. xi, 36; Col. ii, 9; and Eph. i, 10.

Heracleon and Ptolemæus (about A. D. 160) belonged to the Italian school of Valentinians. Heracleon is, so far as we know, the first commentator on the New Testament. He wrote comments on the gospels of Luke and John, fragments of which have been preserved by Origen and by Clement of Alexandria. These fragments have been edited and published by Mr. A. E. Brooke.* The passages from Paul's epistles given by Mr. Brooke as having been used by Heracleon are Rom. i, 25; vi, 21; xiii, 4 (perhaps also v, 15); 1 Cor. x, 5; xv, 53, ff.; Gal. iii, 19; and 2 Tim. ii, 13. Ptolemæus wrote a letter to an "honorable sister Flora," which is given to us by Epiphanius. In it Ptolemæus quotes, as from "Paul the apostle," 1 Cor. v, 7, 8; he also quotes Rom. vii, 12, and Eph. ii, 15. From Irenæus it would appear that Ptolemæus also used Galatians and Colossians. †

Besides witnesses to individual epistles there are also witnesses in the second century to collections of books of the New Testament. The earliest *Canon* is that of the gnostic Marcion, dating from about A. D. 140. It contains ten of Paul's epistles—although they were somewhat mutilated—which, according to Tertullian, were arranged in the following order: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians (called by Marcion Laodiceans), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. *The Muratorian Fragment*, so called because it was discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, in a manuscript of the seventh or eighth century, was published by him in 1740. The date most commonly assigned to the original of the fragment is about A. D. 170. Its authorship is unknown. It contains a part of a canon of the New Testament, beginning in the middle of a sentence which relates to the gospel of Mark. In this canon thirteen epistles are ascribed to Paul, and are named in the following order: 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians,

* *Texts and Studies*, vol. i, No. 4: *The Fragments of Heracleon*.

† See Westcott on the *Canon*, and Charteris, *Canonicity*.

Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and Romans. These form a class addressed to churches. A second class consists of those addressed to individuals: "an epistle to Philemon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy."

The two very ancient versions of Scripture—namely, the *Peshito*, or Syriac, version, used by the Syrian churches, and the Old Latin version, used by the African churches—are thought by many to date from the second century. But the date of neither of them is certainly known. They each contained the thirteen epistles of Paul; they each omitted certain books of our New Testament.

The works of the chief authorities have now been examined down to the period when it is generally admitted that our Pauline epistles were in existence. In summing up the facts drawn from the early Christian writers, the testimony of Barnabas, of Ignatius, and of the Epistle to Diognetus will be left out of account, as, for reasons previously noticed, some may distrust it, although with others it would have great weight. But, if included, it would not appreciably vary the result.

Summary. The epistles especially authenticated by the early Christian writers, in that they are mentioned or formally quoted by one or both of the two most important subapostolic witnesses, Clement and Polycarp, are 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Philippians. Possibly 2 Thessalonians, if Lardner's view is correct, is also to be added. Passages from 1 Corinthians are quoted as Paul's by both Clement and Polycarp. The author of the *Homily* couples together "the books and the apostles," that is, the Old and the New Testament,* and uses, as declarations of "the apostles," passages from Ephesians, and perhaps also from Colossians. A passage from 1 Corinthians is quoted as Paul's by Justin, and passages from 1 and 2 Corinthians as "from the apostle," by Athenagoras. Quotations from Romans and from 1 Timothy are called "the divine word" by Theophilus. Six epistles, then, namely, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Romans, 2 Corinthians, and 1 Timothy, are expressly attested, three being of the undisputed class and three of the disputed. It may be that Colossians and 2 Thessalonians, also of the latter class, should be added. But of these six, 1 Co-

* Lightfoot: *Clement of Rome*, vol. ii, p. 245.

rinthians, Ephesians, and Philippians have much the strongest authentication, for the testimony of Clement and of Polycarp, who lived in the first century, is of course of more value than that of Athenagoras and of Theophilus, who lived near the close of the second century. Notice also that emphatic testimony is given to 1 Corinthians and to Ephesians by more than one witness.

The less formal references it is more difficult to classify and to grade. Still, in estimating them, too, the frequency, the clearness, and the date of the allusions give helps by which their value may be judged. All the early Christian testimony, taken together, then, and weighed as nearly as it can be, places the epistles, in respect to their external evidence, in somewhat the following order: 1 Corinthians takes the first rank, and Ephesians the next, not only on account of their early formal mention, but also on account of the frequency of their use. Philippians is, all things considered, perhaps the next best attested, as being expressly mentioned by Polycarp. Romans, however, and also 1 Timothy, are referred to by more authors than Philippians. These two take the next rank; but Romans takes precedence of 1 Timothy. Colossians, 2 Corinthians, and 1 Thessalonians make the next group. 2 Thessalonians (if not referred to by Polycarp) and Titus follow these. 2 Timothy, Galatians, and Philemon are the least attested. Of Philemon we might expect that there would be but few traces.

In the fragments from the early heretical writers we find evidence of the use of eight epistles, namely, the four called undisputed and four of the others. 1 Corinthians is used by seven of the authorities cited; Romans by five; Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians each by four; 2 Corinthians by two; Philippians and 2 Timothy each by one. The witnesses to collections of books attest the genuineness of all the thirteen epistles, except that Marcion omits the pastoral epistles—an omission, however, which has the less force inasmuch as he is known to have dealt arbitrarily with other parts of the canon. An important consideration should be borne in mind, however, which has been left out of view in making the foregoing summary, that is, the great difference in the length and the character of the epistles. The four "undisputed" are the longest, while all the other nine taken together are only three fifths as long as

they. Again, epistles to churches, and especially prominent churches like those at Rome and at Corinth, would be more likely to be cited than letters to individuals, like the pastoral epistles. Indeed, it seems surprising that 1 Timothy is relatively so much used as it is.

In conclusion it need only be said that the facts which have been collected obviously do not fit well into the Tübingen theory. On the contrary, they are in direct variance with it. If the Christian witnesses of the first two centuries had foreseen the speculations of the nineteenth century and had chosen their extracts from Paul with a set purpose of confuting them, they could hardly have done better than they have. To several epistles which men at the present day "think to be less honorable" they have "given more abundant honor." Galatians, on the other hand, they have only very slightly noticed, although this epistle is the one whose Pauline origin is most confidently assumed by Baur, and whose contents furnish the main support of his hypothesis. The foregoing argument is not designed to confute those extreme critics, like Loman and Steck, who deny the genuineness of all the Pauline epistles. Such men can in their way evade the force of the testimony, conclusive as it may be to most. The argument, it must be remembered, is aimed at those who assume the genuineness of the first four epistles and deny that of the others. And the clear result is to show that this assumption is directly opposed to the historical evidence.

C. T. Mead.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

OPINION.

IN our editorial consideration of the Evangelical Church case, under "Current Discussions" in the present issue of the *Review*, we have desired and earnestly endeavored to deal as fairly as our best obtainable information makes possible with an aggravated, sensitive, and strangely complicated condition of affairs. We do not imagine our examination to be complete or our knowledge exhaustive; but we have received nothing from rumor, have listened to no partisan representations, and most assuredly have written without prejudice, no one of the actors in the strife being personally known to us. We are impressed that the courts, whose judgment has been invoked to settle critical questions arising out of the controversy, have labored with patient painstaking to search out the facts and consequent rights of the whole great struggle and to utter impartially the dispassionate, just, and equitable verdict of the law.

The matters which we have treated as facts have been so accepted only upon high and careful authority; and, beyond the facts, we have simply spoken of the impressions created and the questions raised in our own mind. We are aware that the condition of things is so highly inflamed and sore that it may, for aught we know, be almost if not quite impossible to touch the subject anywhere without causing pain and evoking protest. We certainly do not dwell upon this singular and prolonged conflict because we find delight in commenting upon the misfortunes and distresses of another religious body, any more than we should take pleasure in examining an ulcer. Surely the Church and the world will be none the worse—probably somewhat the better—if we, as well as the sufferers in the case, can discover and lay to heart any lesson of practical wisdom in their present grievous and lamentable experience. We have been actuated by no disposition to censure, but only by a desire to study and search out, to the end that we may learn.

We feel a sorrowful and wholly kindly sympathy for the worthy members of a denomination now so torn and rent asunder after a long and goodly record of usefulness. Looking upon the Evangelical Association in its history and in its present painful plight, all Christian bodies must deplore that such dissensions should have arisen to destroy the harvest of its prosperity and blast the blossoms of its promise.

A word to contributors. One of the long-standing customs of this office does not seem to be generally known. The rule which experience has made necessary is that the *Review* does not print any contributed article

which is a review of a book. Manuscripts in which the pages are filled across, no marginal space being left, are undesirable. Sheets written on both sides cause inconvenience and annoyance. No notes, corrections, references, interpolations, or anything else should ever be put on the back of a sheet.

We regret to be compelled to say that some of the compositions we receive are very discomposing to our compositors by reason of the careless and illegible chirography of the composers. Some manuscripts are such cryptographic puzzles that the work of deciphering the hieroglyphics and putting the article in type is tedious and costly. The acceptability of an article may sometimes turn on a point of this kind.

Is not a legible—we do not say elegant—handwriting as obligatory upon all persons in civilized, certainly in educated, society as good manners are? Has one any more right to make his writing a cause of trial, vexation, weariness, and expense to his fellow-men than he has to make his personal presence offensive and burdensome? Is this a mere technicality of etiquette, or does it amount to a question of morals? Is it lawful to put upon others the labor and pains we ourselves should take? Would it be proper to send to this or any other editorial office a contributed article written in Russian, Welsh, or Norwegian and requiring to be translated by us?

WE are asked to furnish proofs of the statement, made on page 802 of the *Review*, that the seeming contradiction between Acts ix, 7, and xxii, 9, might be reconciled by reference to the well-known Greek usage of the partitive genitive. For a general discussion of the subject we refer our correspondent to Thayer's revised edition of Winer's *New Testament Grammar*, pp. 197–200, and also to Green's *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament*, pp. 208, 209. Green says of ἀκούω, that it is followed by both genitive and accusative, and that "the genitive of the thing probably inclines to the partitive sense." He then gives the two texts referred to above, explaining the former, "They heard of the voice, that is, its sound, but not what it said." Substantially the same explanation of the discrepancy is given by Alford, Hackett, Lange, Meyer, and others, although some of them think the mere distinction in the case of the noun is not so much to be leaned upon as the double meaning of the verb, to hear, which in the English idiom, as well as in the Greek, sometimes means to understand the significance of what is spoken and sometimes merely to catch a confused, unintelligible sound.

A SEASON of commercial distress, some two years old in England, and domiciled in this country for some months, is naturally enough coincident with the appearance of considerable literature having a distinctly pessimistic color. The most conspicuous English books of this complexion—we mean among those having a philosophical value—are probably those of Mr. C. H. Pearson and Mr. Walter Pater. Neither is avowedly pessi-

mistic, and they are as unlike as possible; and yet they have a common philosophical spirit in them. The first, under the title, *National Life and Character: A Forecast*, arrays a vast number of facts, showing tendencies unpleasant to vainglorious British pride; such as that the lower classes may soon predominate in England and the lower races rule the entire world at a period not distant. The suggestion of a philosophy underlying it all, that the restlessness and acquisitiveness of the English tribe must at length weary and exhaust it, is rather implicit than explicit. Mr. Pater's *Plato and Platonism* revolves around the republic of Plato as a philosophical, and yet more or less subtly practical, attempt to call the attention of his countrymen to the dangers of their fast and furious life of adventure, novelty, and enterprise. The spiritual content of both books is, not in terms, but in the deeper sense of them, a delicate and cautious criticism of the century just passed, which may, not altogether in caricature, be described as a century of "booms."

We need not array the proof that this newspaper word fairly describes the conditions and spirit of the hundred years behind us. It is not merely a condition of progress, of change, of new things and new forms in abundance, nor yet of invention and of scientific and mental triumphs; it is much more a fluid and mobile state of human society, with immense displacements of population and conquests and colonizations all round the world, with mill-building and city-building—all accompanied by the hopefulness and buoyant, not to say flamboyant, enthusiasms which mark the development of a "boom." The material and statistical facts are important enough; but more important is the impress this movement makes on human character. The common and, let us hope, the sound belief approves enterprise in all its swift processes of change; but there is something to be said for a sober and steadfast world. According to Mr. Pater the idealizing and speculative Plato said all that there is to say long ago, and said it with strict reference to the unsatisfactoriness of the "boom" as a spiritual element in the creation of character. For his Athens was as full of enterprise, movement, change, as it was possible for a small State of that age to be; and it lived in close touch with all the uncertainties of domestic and foreign politics, and delighted itself in great improvements "and new expansions of political privilege"—very much as the modern Englishman and American do.

Doubtless Plato was not alone in feeling that the centrifugal forces in Athenian life had death in them; the "boom" was sure to extinguish the nationality it kept in a fluid mass ready to be blown in any direction, especially in the direction of ruin. From this philosophical view of his own Athens—a view not so much expressed as implied in his scheme of an ideal republic—Plato turned to Sparta as a quiet, orderly, and steadfast land, where men grew up in bonds of inflexible discipline and, when grown, went on applying this perfect discipline to the next generation. There, never was a "boom" known; progress was such as we see in the growth of a tree, slow and orderly, without enterprise and without periods of panic and depression, and especially without a trace of the cor-

rupt politics of Athens and of our modern world. We cannot express sympathy with that Dorian life as a whole; but some part of its disciplinary spirit might be desirable. It would perhaps relieve us of the danger of having periodically to liquidate our booms at great cost and in much humiliation of soul.

The pessimist is never a success: Plato was not. He could not stay for a moment the inevitable collapse of the "boom" public and social life at Athens. Nor in our modern order can the philosopher of sorrows to come expect a large audience. We have, indeed, a successful type of political pessimist; but he succeeds by the "boom" method. "Everything," he tells us, "is wrong; but pass this little bill of mine, and the sun will shine again." He is much addicted to finding the causes of all evils in groups of persons—for example, in those who are so depraved as to lend him money—and not unfrequently starts a "boom" for some form of sectionalism. In short, this pessimist is an agitator, a peddler of novelties, and a part of the centrifugal forces which, if they were not checked by the Constitution of the United States, would as surely wreck us as they wrecked Athens.

The habit of change, the expectation of change, the desire of change—these three represent as many disintegrating forces. They may be successfully resisted by general confidence. In ordinary conditions they probably are effectively resisted. But there are signs that they must have their hour with us and that it cannot be a happy season for us. For example, we have scurried from the Atlantic to the Pacific with incredible speed, and we begin to perceive that presently we shall have no new country to boom. The fear of change in economic conditions is already expressed by more than one man with a scheme of legislation to suggest, and by a silent multitude who are asking in their hearts, "What are we to do for a new expansion of the republic?" The expectation of change arrests production or sets it spinning gayly along. We have seen both in the last three years, caused by tariff tinkering. The forecast all men in a "boom" civilization must make or suffer when change comes requires too much mental effort for the mass of men; and so our history revolves around the acrobatic financial feats of a few speculators in natural conditions and in human credulity. The habit of change imparts restlessness to youth, breaks the strength of maturity, and embitters age. So little can be depended upon to remain constant!

In spite of the increase of schools—some think in consequence of it—the disciplines necessary to the making of men out of boys are more and more relaxed and flaccid. We all sigh sometimes for a touch of the Spartan order in education—that is, in the whole rearing of men. We are as yet saved by the maintenance of older ideals about the rearing of girls; but even here the impatient spirit of our boom civilization is producing some effects unpleasant to look upon. Some minds have turned hopefully to military discipline as a possible remedy; but testimony concerning the moral effects of barrack life cuts off any hope in that direction. What human character needs is a discipline of the entire nature of man. That Sparta obtained;

but we have no relish for the whole result at Sparta, though the Spartan man commands our respect, and sometimes our admiration.

The only hope for us must rest somehow in our Christianity. In generations behind us our faith, as expressed in Puritanism and in other religious forms, did yield a sober and patient discipline. Nothing Spartan commands so much of our approval as the best aspects of Puritan character and life; and there is no intelligent critic of that life, however hostile, who will affirm that our life is, on the whole, higher and nobler than that of the Puritan. Whoever believes in Christianity as divine knows that our health will surely come out of our faith. We cannot be pessimists—things are not at the worst; we have our religion and its glorious history to assure us. The “boom” civilization must pass, but a Christian discipline as strong as the Puritan, but wiser and more refined and more affectionate, will come to give us a better good than Sparta had, a more rational tranquillity, and an order of life in which the human affections are recognized and cultivated and wherein freedom is reconciled with obedience. A sounder philosophy of order and stability, of culture and peace, than Plato dreamed of lies fully revealed in our New Testament. When the “boom” civilization “accomplishes its mission” we shall doubtless find grace given us to apply that philosophy to American life. And it is certain that “new light may break out of the word” for an exhausted and distressed people, whose mobility has shattered itself against the limitations of the natural world. A perfect order, restful, strong, and tranquil, lies in our religion. They are foolish who dream that we have exhausted it; for we have not as yet fully applied it to the springs of individual life by a systematic Christian discipline.

The evils of our overhasty and rashly speculative civilization have their roots in the weak side of human nature. Our society is not mobile—a society on wheels, as we would flatter ourselves—merely because we are enterprisingly impatient to make the world a blossoming garden spaced out with stately and proud cities, or merely because we delight in achievement and honor it without measure; but mainly because self-indulgence and phenomenal acquisitiveness produce restlessness and impatience, break down self-discipline, and incapacitate us for disciplining our children. At this point the old Spartan held himself down, so to say; for if his discipline was harsh toward others it was at least equally harsh toward himself. Nor has any one ever charged that that nobler Spartan, our heroic Puritan, dealt more mildly with himself than with his children or his servants. Christianity attacks the roots of self-indulgence. But its more effective work appears when the mobile enthusiasms over earthly achievements are supplanted by stern principles of conduct and by profound faith in a judgment day and immortal blessedness. Our mobility attaches to our worldliness and our obscured vision of the world to come. The perilous tendencies of it may be checked by a large system of spiritual culture, through which the heroism of endurance and the tranquillity of assurance may be combined with a higher measure than the world has ever known of productive energy and economic thrift.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

THE DISSENSIONS IN THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NORTH AMERICA.

WHATEVER happens in one religious body, even were it the least, is matter of interest to all other bodies so far as it affects the credit of religion and the moral and spiritual welfare of mankind. The Evangelical Association, though not large, can hardly be regarded by us as an unimportant body. With the grave dissensions which for some time have disturbed, distracted, divided, and threatened almost to destroy it we cannot help feeling a deep and peculiar concern, inasmuch as it is in reality, though not in name, a branch of the Methodist family, and the natural sympathy we have with it because of blood relationship makes us especially lament to see its prosperity clouded, its usefulness impaired, and its fair record blotted. In origin, spirit, organization, government, doctrine, and history it has been strongly Methodistic. Looking back from the present upon its origin, it seems to us to have been auspiciously born. Abating what seem to us some errors of judgment, we cannot help regarding with respect that earnest gospeler, Jacob Albright, a Methodist exhorter, who, being filled from God with anxiety for the conversion of his German brethren, began independent religious labors among them in true missionary spirit at a time when the Methodist Episcopal Church, busy with other tasks, had not yet to any considerable extent trained German preachers or entered upon its German work, which has since grown to creditable proportions both in this country and Europe. Possibly if Albright and his fellows had remained with us the work which he undertook would have been taken up earlier by our own Church; nevertheless his was a noble impatience, and he went forth to become the father of a new denomination known at first as "Albright Methodists" and "German Methodists." In the ninety years since its organization that Church, which was then purely German, has become partly English, while ours, which then had no German Conferences, has now eleven. Albright began his work in the closing years of the last century, preaching in the German tongue with great power through Pennsylvania and parts of Maryland and Virginia. There being no provision for the religious nurture of his converts in their own language in the Methodist Episcopal Church, he and they moved off into independency by force of circumstances, and with the conviction that in such freedom they might better carry on their particular work than under the control and direction of a body less eager in that special line of labor.

First organized in Berks County, Pa., in 1803, it has spread over this continent as far north as Canada, as far south as Texas, west to the Pacific coast, as well as into Switzerland and Germany, and has grown to twenty-five Annual Conferences: East Pennsylvania, Central Pennsylvania, Pittsburg, Atlantic, New York, Canada, Erie, Ohio, Indiana,

South Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota, Iowa, Des Moines, Kansas, Nebraska, Platte River, California, Oregon, Texas, Germany, and Switzerland. It now numbers over 2,000 churches, 1,250 preachers, and 150,000 members. It has been marked throughout its career by Wesleyan fervor and evangelistic zeal; for which reason the measure of its service to the cause of truly spiritual Christianity has not, in proportion to its numbers, been small.

Our interest in the strange events now and for some years transpiring in the Evangelical Association is increased by the fact that they occur under a system of organization and government very like our own, and one which has been supposed to be, by reason largely of the few respects in which it varies from us, less liable to such disturbances than ours. These occurrences start in our minds the query whether proceedings so singular are under our own system more possible, less possible, or possible at all. The Methodist Episcopal Church is not only the mother but the prototype of that denomination. The plan of its ecclesiastical organization is modeled closely upon ours, with certain variations which its constructors adopted because they considered them improvements. Retaining our system of Quarterly, Annual, and General Conferences, superintendents or bishops, presiding elders, an itinerant ministry, denominational and church boards, with other things general and particular, it differs as follows: Its bishops are elected, not for life, but for a term of four years, and are not ordained or consecrated, but receive a term license from the General Conference, signed by the chairman and secretary; the following persons, if elders, are *ex officio* members of the General Conference: the senior book agent, editors of the official church papers, magazines, and Sunday school literature, the corresponding secretary of the Missionary Society, and the bishops, when not in the chair; in the Annual Conferences the presiding elders are elected by the Conference, and the pastoral appointments are made, not by the bishop, but by the presiding elders and the bishop coordinately; the transfer of a preacher across Conference boundaries by a bishop requires the consent of the preacher and of the Conference to which he is transferred; in each society the class leaders are elected. The above are some of the more important differentiations which mark the evolution of this denomination from ours.

All the judicious must grieve, none but groundlings can laugh, and only the wicked rejoice, when any religious body is so rent by differences it cannot compose and quarrels it is unable to quell that it is obliged to resort to the civil courts as the only authority left with power sufficient to command respect and enforce decisions. When any denomination or society by noise of angry brawling and bitterness of wanton strife is guilty of disturbing unnecessarily the peace of Christendom there should be some way of haling it before a supreme court of Christian judgment for censure, compelling it to give bonds before it is allowed to go under penitent promise of good behavior. There may be strifes that bring to the religious world humiliation, sorrow, and scandal, not less, but more, than the fanatical murderous Moslem attacks upon Christians in Damascus in 1861

or the bloody conflicts between Hindoos and Mohammedans in Bombay and Rangoon in 1893, since these were the crimes of unchristianized populations, while those to which we refer are the warring of brethren whose common Master, patient, meek, and lowly of heart, forbids them to fight.

The troubles of the Evangelical Association seem to have arisen out of jealousies, oppositions, and controversies of the bishops among themselves, or, if not this, then in their acts and utterances relative to certain existing quarrels, in which we behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth, and how fraught with danger are the beginnings of strife. After fermenting, spreading, and intensifying for several years these conflicts first came to official denominational notice at the General Conference in Buffalo in September, 1887, at which charges of having carried an official journal into episcopal contentions by making it the advocate of the views and attitude of Bishop Dubs as against Bishops Bowman and Esher, were preferred against the Rev. H. B. Hartzler, editor of *The Evangelical Messenger*, the English-speaking organ of the Church. The trial concluded with a verdict of guilty and the removal of the editor, which also cast the shadow of its condemnation, by implication, across the course of Bishop Dubs. The discussion and vote in this case had the effect to commit most of the voters to one side or the other of the episcopal conflict, and to divide the denomination in sentiment into two hostile camps upon the merits of the dispute. The proceedings of the nineteenth General Conference only aggravated the soreness and sourness, and when it adjourned its members dispersed from Buffalo to their homes in unamiable temper, some of them bent on involving the entire Church in the struggle, and ready to exhaust all resources of belligerent action. Thus the contention went abroad throughout the Evangelical Association, dividing Conferences and congregations, and appearing presently in the civil courts of many States in lawsuits brought to determine the legitimacy of rival claimants to various pastorates and the valid title to church properties claimed by opposing factions in certain societies. One such suit was brought by persons resident in Reading, Pa., before the proper local tribunal, and the judgment of the duly appointed master and examiner, Mr. Louis Richards, a Presbyterian, indorsed by the court, Judge G. A. Endlich, a Lutheran, has been published by those in whose favor decision was rendered, in order that by its circulation their vindication by that court, with the reasons therefor, may be known to the general public.

The simple point at issue and submitted in the bill filed November 27, 1891, in the Court of Common Pleas of Berks County, Pa., by the Rev. Augustus Kreckler and others, plaintiffs, against the Rev. Jonas H. Shirey and others, defendants, was whether Kreckler and his party or Shirey and his party had legal claim to the pastorate and property of Immanuel Church in the city of Reading; but as the lawful occupancy of said pastorate and premises depended on previous regular and disciplinary appointment to such pastorate by qualified authority, the court, in order to render just decision upon the particular question, was com-

pelled to trace authority to its source and to test its sanctions, which necessitated an examination of almost the entire history of the troubles that have disturbed the Evangelical Association for the past six or eight years; so that judgment is also passed, expressly or implicitly, on most if not all of the questions involved in or raised by the denominational contention. Thus the court not only renders formal judicial decision on the specific point as to the pastorate of the church in Reading and the legal status of the opposing parties therein, but also utters its opinion as to the rival claims to authority of the two majority and minority bodies into which the East Pennsylvania Annual Conference split itself in 1891, and, further, as to the legal standing of each of the men, Dubs, Bowman, and Esher, formerly bishops, now claimants; and, further still, as to the composition, constitutionality, and authority of the two alleged General Conferences which met in October, 1891, the one in Indianapolis and the other in Philadelphia.

The rulings of the Berks County court, which constitute the first decision of a Pennsylvania court upon the Evangelical Church controversy after report of a master and full argument, are in substance as follows:

1. The trial of Bowman in 1890 was lawfully conducted, and its sentence of suspension was operative until action by the succeeding General Conference.

2. The previous exculpation of Bowman by three elders was utterly lacking in disciplinary requisites, and, therefore, wholly invalid.

3. The East Pennsylvania Annual Conference, presided over in 1891 by the Rev. C. S. Ryman, was the only lawful and regular East Pennsylvania Conference, and its ministerial appointments the only valid ones; consequently J. H. Shirey is lawful pastor of Immanuel Church, Reading.

4. The action of the trustees and congregation of Immanuel Church in excluding Kreeker was legally proper and justifiable.

5. The assemblage in Indianapolis in October, 1891, was not the lawful General Conference, because the place for holding it had not been fixed in accordance with the directions of the Discipline, the power to do which belonged in the circumstances only to the oldest Annual Conference, the East Pennsylvania.

6. The assembly at the same time in Philadelphia was not the lawful General Conference, for the reason that it lacked a constitutional quorum.

7. If the Indianapolis body had been lawful its action on the case of Bowman was invalid because not rendered in accordance with disciplinary requirements or the common law governing judicial procedure.

8. The trust declared in the deed of conveyance of the premises on which the Sixth Street Church, Reading, is built is lawful and valid. These rulings, it must be noted, are at variance with the judgment of some court or courts in other States, and may be overruled by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, to which the defeated plaintiffs have appealed the case.

The court incidentally passes criticism on ecclesiastical codes and methods of procedure as they appear in the light of the canons of civil

jurisprudence. As is frequent in civil tribunals, the incompleteness of church law and the insufficiency of constitutional and disciplinary provisions come under notice and excite judicial remark. The Berks County examiner characterizes certain proceedings as "a travesty upon even ecclesiastical jurisprudence." He remarks that civil courts are obliged to be liberal "in overlooking the eccentricities of ecclesiastical judicatories;" that most ecclesiastical codes are adapted to conditions of harmony rather than of contention, to times of peace and not to epochs of revolution, and, construed as systems of law, are found to be silent or ambiguous upon many points where it were desirable they should be explicit and distinct; that in ecclesiastical disputes it is common for partisan contentions to take eventually a personal character, which we affirm to be no more usual in Church than in State; that quarrels in a Church are proverbially bitter and irreconcilable. He is of opinion that a rule which permits accusers to select examiners and examiners to summon triers is not well calculated to insure an unprejudiced judgment. He comments upon "the latitude of interpretation of their own rules habitual with religious bodies," rules and forms being looked upon by them as of "little importance compared with the furtherance of the Church's spiritual mission." Examiner Richards says that many zealous and estimable clergymen who would go to the stake in defense of their systems of faith are not strict constructionists in respect to ecclesiastical rules, but that when civil courts get hold of ecclesiastical codes they are obliged to hew to the line in giving them interpretation, and that "a great many matters are transacted in ecclesiastical assemblies which, though gross departures from form, receive the general approval and pass without question."

Incidentally the Berks County examiner refers to various points which have been permanently settled for religious organizations by decisions of secular courts, among which are rulings embodying the general doctrine that the ecclesiastical, like the civil governments, are restrained and controlled by their own constitutions and laws, which they will not be permitted to infringe to the prejudice of the rights or privileges of any of their clergy, laity, or associated membership; that no Church can be allowed to maintain an ecclesiastical despotism to the detriment of any rights of which the civil authority can take cognizance, and that equity will interfere to prevent any act which is contrary to the law of the land or of the body itself; that if the officary of a Methodist Episcopal society refuse to receive a preacher appointed by the bishops it is an act of insubordination to the Church and a violation of its Discipline, and the civil courts will issue a peremptory mandamus commanding the officers, even though backed by the entire congregation, to admit the bishop's appointee; that the intention of the founders of any Church or institution is the polar star which must guide in deciding as to the constitutionality of any questioned actions therein; that where a Church is founded as a Calvinist Church no person who does not receive and preach the entire system of theology taught by that faith has a right to occupy its pulpit, and a court of equity will restrain such person from officiating.

Incidentally the master and examiner turns preacher, holds up to the Christian body whose contentions are before the court the precepts of its great Master, admonishes for disobedience thereof, rebukes the superfluity of naughtiness, and suggests repentance. In particular he comments upon the addresses of Bowman and Esher before the Indianapolis assemblage as approximating in spirit "the diatribes of the ancient Hebrew prophets" toward their enemies, although "their phraseology is much more strongly suggestive of the harangues of the modern political convention," especially in denouncing "the wicked plans of the opposition," whom they described as enemies of the Church, foes unprincipled and desperate, mutineers who should be put in irons or thrown overboard. The civil tribunal suggests that "that charity which is so large an element of the faith of both parties, and which is said by one of the apostles of their religion to be the greatest of all Christian virtues, ought before this to have brought about a reconciliation." It points them to their own Discipline, which declares that strife and litigation are contrary to their duty, and which exhorts them "to avoid all manner of violence, tyranny, and unmerciful or rash treatment, whereby they or others might suffer either in body or in soul, such as quarreling, brawling, and hatred, brother going to law with brother, recompensing evil for evil, rendering railing for railing." Noting that Christian perfection is one of the accepted tenets of their faith, it satirically hints that the road by which some of the combatants expect to attain this high grace must be indicated in the words of their Discipline, "Some, indeed, say that this cannot be attained until we have passed through purgatory."

The Evangelical Association presents such a spectacle as has seldom been seen in ecclesiastical history; a spectacle which, if the Pennsylvania court is right, would be substantially duplicated in the republic if opposing parties had so embroiled civil and political affairs as to produce a situation where there was in the nation no lawful and recognized president, no lawful and respected legislative or judicial body, and in various States of the Union rival governors and rival legislatures all claiming for themselves the sole legality. As the trouble began with the bishops, or, at least became serious by their interference, so, also, the subsequent disturbances have circled around their attitude and action, and have had episcopal participation and leadership.

The singular course of events as described in official records suggests a few reflections, first of all this: We see here a system failing to secure the very thing which it was a particular design of its construction to insure. The Evangelical Association seems to have been born with a dread of episcopal power, and while, by force of inheritance and education, as well as by a perception of the advantages of the episcopal form of church government, it was led to adopt that form, its episcopophobia moved it to reduce the office of bishop to the minimum of importance, influence, and dignity, and to lace it so tight within inelastic limitations that it scarcely had lawful room to breathe. It is somewhat anomalous that from an episcopacy so systematically and severely minimized there should break forth the

most astonishing display of arbitrary temper and reckless audacity in official action; so that the examiner feels provoked to remark that a successor of Jacob Albright may set up as pope and that in Albright's church, as aforetime in the Romish, there may even be a pair of popes. If such unseemly episcopal behavior had occurred in the Methodist Episcopal Church somebody in the Evangelical Association would undoubtedly have pointed it out with an "I-told-you-so" tone as due to the life tenure and corresponding comparative independence of our bishops, as a fulfillment of their prophecies of disaster in our system of administration and in proof of their superior wisdom in narrowly limiting the powers of a bishop, reducing his authority to a minimum, and especially in making the office elective for a four years' term—a plan specially invented and supposed to be infallible for the purpose of keeping bishops on their good behavior. But the record is that our episcopacy, which the fathers of the Evangelical Association regarded with apprehension, and which they endeavored, when forming a new church, to reduce to a mere shadow and nominality, has never made such a shameful show of itself or brought our Church into such confusion and strife. Along this line lies long historic cause for thankfulness as well as extended evidence of the soundness of Methodist Episcopal policy. The weakness and peril they allege in our system have not appeared; the strength and safety claimed for theirs seem conspicuously wanting. We do not perceive anything in the events now transpiring in that denomination calculated to incline Episcopal Methodism to withdraw its objections to a quadrennial and every way belittled episcopacy. It is not impossible that the course of these bishops of the Evangelical Association should raise in the mind of some spectator the question whether a larger share of responsibility put upon them by the Church for the creditable conduct of affairs might not have a tendency to promote a greater sense of responsibility, with consequent increase of becoming dignity and needful sobriety.

The record of episcopal conduct in the Evangelical Association during recent years suggests a doubt, to put it mildly, of the personal fitness of the bishops for their office and of the wisdom of the association in selecting those men. Some of their actions make them appear unworthy of even that modicum of power with which the denomination grudgingly intrusted them. If the association had been as cautious in choosing its bishops as it was in safeguarding the office certain strange chapters of history would not have been written. No organization can get the benefit of personal power and administrative ability in its highest officers without allowing scope for the exercise thereof; and while authority and its functions must be clearly defined by the body which confers it and carefully observed by him who receives it, the greatest security after all for a wise, safe conduct of affairs will be found in the man himself, in his pure intention, sound sense, self-control, and executive capacity, without which no amount of statutory limitation can possibly provide for judicious and competent administration. A sane man at large is safer for the neighborhood than a lunatic in a straitjacket.

Without underrating the value of a well-constructed system of government with powers so equitably distributed and parts so fitly coordinated as to run smoothly like a perfect piece of mechanical engineering, the history we are now contemplating impresses us anew with the overshadowing importance of the personal factor in administration. Everywhere manly quality and capability are the things that tell. "There's more in the man than there is in the land" is one of Sidney Lanier's dialect poems. Farragut, at the beginning of the war, was prejudiced against ironclads, and objected to commanding one, saying, "No, give me a wooden vessel and put the iron in the men." Victory is always more in the men than in the machine. An ignorant, inattentive, self-indulgent, or rashly venturesome captain will run upon the rocks the finest steamship ever built. Once in a Methodist Conference a member of it arose and said to the presiding officer, "Bishop, I had pleasure in voting for you in the General Conference which elected you. I hope you are not about to compel me to repent of my action." The minister's apprehension proved unfounded; but it would seem that many of the delegates to the General Conference of the Evangelical Association, which met in Buffalo in 1887, must long since have regretted the votes by which they elected three men to the office of bishop. If the comments of the Berks County court are correct it would seem that there was among the bishops no ecclesiastical lawyer, no one acquainted with the common principles of law or even mindful of the explicit directions of their own Discipline, nor one properly endowed with discretion, though Bishop Dubs comes nearer to it than the others, who in the heat of partisanship lost whatever senses they had, and rushed madly into methods certain to thwart, if nothing else did, the very purposes they were determined at all hazards to accomplish, methods so thoroughly unwarrantable as to invalidate all acts performed thereunder.

The Church of God suffers mortification and dire injury when a bishop, instead of being calm and dispassionate, is excited and passionate; instead of maintaining impartiality espouses the cause of a faction, training in its ranks or even beating a drum at the head of a party column; instead of healing strife fomenting dissensions; instead of being careful, clean, and moderate in speech indulges in intemperate, vulgar, or abusive utterances which a civil court excuses itself from repeating because they are "too offensive to be reproduced;" instead of showing observant respect to all proper forms, precedents, and laws disregards them in a manner little less than revolutionary.

What kind of a bishop is he who, being found guilty and suspended by what a civil court decides is a duly constituted Trial Conference, conducted in strict accordance with the Discipline, gives himself a certificate of innocence, ignores the order of an authoritative church court, and continues to exercise all the functions from which he has been suspended, denouncing his accusers as liars and all questioners of his authority as rebels? What shall be said of a bishop who supposes that he can withdraw less than one fourth of the members from a Conference num-

bering ninety-two and organize that small minority into a Conference on the steps outside the front door of a church edifice within which the majority, including all the presiding elders, is in session under a duly chosen president, having refused to recognize the bishop because they understood him to have been regularly suspended from the functions of his office; who thinks he can constitute a less than one-fourth minority into the legal East Pennsylvania Annual Conference by his mere decree, with the approval of that minority; and who with this fictitious fiat Conference, declaring the more than three-quarter majority to be in revolt, proceeds to create presiding elders, assign pastors, and transact all business as if there could be any validity in such transactions? That the same Bishop Bowman, at Des Moines, in 1890, retired with only six ministers to his room at the hotel and there transacted the business of the Conference is not surprising. How are bishops to be characterized who imagine that they have power to blow an Annual Conference into everlasting nowhere by the mere breath of their mouths, as Esher and Bowman did in 1890, when they announced officially to the Church that the Platte River Conference had ceased to exist, simply because, for reasons which it believed to be legal and obligatory, it would not have one of them to preside over it? But astonishment passes all bounds when we find by the history that these acts and proceedings of the bishops have been pronounced lawful and regular by a body claiming to be the General Conference, and made up of delegates from twenty-three Conferences; and that the same body ordered that ministers by the score, in full membership and good standing, should be expelled from the Church as outlaws without any citation, form of trial, or opportunity to face charges and make defense or answer, thus violating the fundamental maxim of the common law that no man shall be condemned without a hearing, and mangling and mutilating the Church of God by a sort of maniacal hacking and hewing.

As between the bishops, after sentence of suspension had been pronounced, the course of Dubs seems to have been wiser than that of Bowman and Esher. If the latter had respected that sentence as Dubs did, biding the disciplinary time and leaving the entire matter to be decided by the next General Conference, each Annual Conference meantime transacting its business under an elected president, as it was entirely qualified to do, and the place of meeting of the General Conference being fixed without participation of the bishops by the oldest Annual Conference in the disciplinary way, there might have been an indisputably lawful General Conference in 1891 competent to consider all the questions at issue, to settle those things which were in suspense, and to arrive at discreet decisions by methods and majorities which would be in harmony with the Discipline of the association and the principles of common law, and would likewise be so correct and weighty as to command the respect of all law-abiding and order-loving ministers and members and oblige the malcontents to keep silence or withdraw. As to the present legal condition of the episcopacy, if the conclusion of the Berks County Common Pleas be correct it is an office without any incumbent, the suspension of the

three bishops in 1890 being valid until the succeeding lawful General Conference; and no such body having met in 1891 nor up to the present time, the Evangelical Association since 1890 has been without bishops, and remains so until a properly constituted General Conference shall assemble—an event which seems no more probable for any future time than it was for 1891.

In reading the opposing decisions of different civil courts upon the merits of this denominational dispute one regrets to observe what is natural enough but by no means gratifying or confidence-inspiring, namely, that most of these decisions are in agreement with the predominant sentiment in the locality where they are arrived at and announced—a fact which, in spite of all averments of impartiality, tends to raise in disinterestedly unbiased minds a suspicion that examiners and judges, even when honest in intention, may have been unconsciously influenced by local atmospheric pressure. So human are men even when loaded by responsibility as heavy as their ermine is light that there is always danger of their absorbing automatically into their blood whatever quality permeates the air they breathe. The planchette, even under honest fingers that do not mean to push, obeys a force which originates within the man, and is moved and guided by a muscular pressure which must proceed from a subconscious volition. Are we saying that no human verdict or conclusion is ever fair, pure, impartial, and just? By no means; but only that there are always subtle elements, as powerful often as they are secret, which work to the imperiling of a perfectly balanced and equitable result.

It strikes us as peculiar that both at Indianapolis and at Philadelphia the body calling itself the General Conference omitted to examine the record of the findings and sentence of the Trial Conference in the case of each bishop whose course it approved, and in contrast did read and examine the record of the Trial Conference, in the case of each bishop whom it disapproved, deposed from office, and expelled from the denomination. When either of these pretended General Conferences intended to set aside the suspension of a bishop it proceeded to do so on his defensive statement simply, without looking at the record which contained the evidence on which he had been suspended by a Trial Conference. On the other hand, when either of these assumed General Conferences meant to condemn a bishop and support the action of the Trial Conference which had suspended him it produced and read the record of the evidence by which his suspension had been, and his deposition would now be, justified. This looks as if each of these two bodies did what it wanted to do, and admitted only such proofs as favored the course it was bent on taking. If this be true there was nothing judicial in the temper or methods of either body.

A long series of technically irregular proceedings through which it appears impossible to trace any logical or constitutional connection that can be a conductor for the currents of disciplinary authority has produced a situation which from a strictly legal standpoint is one of utter chaos, all true validity having been vitiated; no government possible, any

more save by the right of might and by arbitrary self-certified authority. The pulling and hauling of five or six years have produced a snarl so complicated and knotted as to admit of no disentanglement upon the correctness of which tribunals, ecclesiastical or civil, can agree. The amount of vituperative and minacious malediction, and also of vindictive and retaliatory action, is so great as well as so intense and extreme as to put out of sight the probability of reconciliation or of the recovery of a pacific temper.

A comparison of resources between the parties to the strife may be made as follows:

ASSETS OF THE BOWMAN-ESHER PARTY.—1. The larger number of civil court decisions in their favor, various courts in Ohio, Oregon, Illinois, and Iowa having sustained their course and position to a greater or less extent. 2. The larger number of Conferences; complete control in eighteen of the twenty undivided Conferences, and a minority following in each of the five divided Conferences. 3. Two thirds of the episcopal board. 4. All the *ex officio* members of the General Conference, that is, missionary secretary, official editors, and senior book agent. 5. Control of the various treasuries of the association. 6. Most of the denominational press. 7. Representatively about three fifths of the entire membership, say ninety thousand.

ASSETS OF THE DUBS PARTY.—1. Opinions in their favor from Judge Pleasants and Judge Shaw, of the Court of Common Pleas in Illinois, Judge Beale, of a similar court in Nebraska, and the Berks County, Pennsylvania, court already mentioned. 2. The solid support of two of the twenty-five Conferences, with a majority in each of the five divided Conferences. 3. One out of the three contending bishops. 4. A preponderance in their favor in each of the four largest and strongest Conferences, the East Pennsylvania, the Central Pennsylvania, the Pittsburg, and the Illinois. 5. Representatively about two fifths of the entire membership of the denomination, say sixty thousand.

This comparative statement, if not absolutely exact in particulars and complete in the total, is at least approximately correct.

As to the future, the ownership of each piece of church property which has been put in litigation will be, of course, determined by the civil courts having jurisdiction over its locality. Beyond this it seems probable that the Bowman-Esher party, by force of superior numbers and the *de facto* control of the general offices, treasuries, and property of the Association, will take all law into their own hands, and, in general, affirming their own regularity and competency, "hold the fort" to the exclusion and disregard of those whom they have branded as wicked rebels and expelled. To an outsider the denomination seems hopelessly divided, and we see nothing for the minority but to withdraw; in which connection there can be no impropriety in our suggesting, without covetousness or proselyting, that their return to the mother Church from which the Evangelical Association of North America sprung would not be unnatural and might be for them a happy issue out of all their troubles.

TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD IN RAILROAD AND OTHER AFFAIRS.

"COMPLETE truthfulness is one of the rarest of virtues." Herbert Spencer is an accepted authority on this point to those who consider that exhaustive, world-wide, and lifelong studies qualify him to make the assertion. Judging from the conduct of many who are conspicuous in human affairs, they prefer the truth where it answers their own purposes best, and falsehood where it does not. The end is held to justify the means. The New York daily newspapers of August 16, 1893, give prominent place to the process whereby one of the great railroads of the country was placed in the hands of receivers, one of whom was the president of the company owning it. This action was said to have been at the instance of creditors, stockholders, and bondholders, and also of a powerful trust company as trustee of the mortgage. It was said that the company, recognizing the wisdom of the proceeding and the necessity of preserving the unity of the property and of continuing the operation of the property for the public convenience, had submitted to the inevitable, and had not opposed the application for a receivership, but had practically joined in it to secure the protection of the courts from the possible assault of creditors and the consequent dismemberment of the railroad system. The best interests of stockholders and creditors, with the conservation of the enormous properties involved, were the ends consulted.

Not a word need be said against these forthgoings on the assumption that they accurately represent the truth. But how can denial by the president, made on the preceding Saturday, August 12, that papers were being drawn up for a receivership, be regarded? This denial is alleged by the *Tribune* to have been couched "in the most unequivocal and emphatic terms." On the 14th it is said that one of the directors was assured by the president that the company was beyond danger of a receivership. Not only that, but on the 16th a vice president of the corporation was quoted as stating that it was perfectly solvent. A holder of large securities also declared that he had been repeatedly assured by the officers of the safety of the company at a time when papers for the receivership must have been in course of preparation, even if they were not completed. One thing is certain, and that is that the president either knew or did not know that efforts were being made to place the railroad in the hands of receivers. If he did not know it, then his ignorance proves his utter unfitness for the presidency of so large a corporation; if he did know it, then his "unequivocal and emphatic" denial equally proves his unfitness to be the chairman, or even one of the board of receivers, much more to take the management of affairs into his own hands. If he did know what was going on, if he were a consenting party to what was to be done, then by what brief, sturdy, Anglo-Saxon term shall his unqualified and strenuous denial be characterized?

The whole transaction, in the view of the Christian ethicist, widens out into a field of observation covering all of worldly time and space, and

suggests lessons upon character and conduct that may be of sterling service to all who are willing to receive them. Putting the worst construction (any other seems to be inadmissible) upon the solemn statements of the railway magnate, it is matter of deepest regret that he is not a solitary instance of that lack of regard for the truth which debars the speaker from approaching within appreciable distance of it. "You know, gentlemen, why I cannot attach my name to that report," said the Methodist secretary of one of the most famous—and infamous—railroad corporations within the State of New York. "O, well, we don't ask you to violate your conscience," was the uneasy reply. But they had virtually asked him to do so, and because he refused they vacated his position under the flimsy pretext that temporary illness incapacitated him for the further discharge of onerous duty. He would not lie. That false reports, perjured statements, and untruthful representations are not uncommon in railroad circles is generally believed, and the belief is too often justified by demonstrated facts. To say that such corrupting and direful phenomena are quite as common in the cliques managing industrial stocks, the directorates of banks and trust companies, the dealers in dividend-paying and speculative securities, the operators on all the natural and manufactured produce exchanges—nay, even among importers, jobbers, wholesale and retail dealers in merchandise—does not help the case in the least. One wrong or ten million wrongs can by no possibility make one right.

Railroad kings are often compared to great military monarchs. The likeness is remarkable in respect of knowledge of affairs, practical wisdom, administrative ability, and, alas! of that peculiar diabolical genius which doles out truth, or half-truth, or fractional truth, or untruth in such measure and in such guise as in their judgment is most likely to compass contemplated aims. "A false report, if believed during three days, may be of great service to a government," is a political maxim ascribed to Catherine de' Medici. A false report, believed for two days, may be of great pecuniary service to railway and other managers by enabling them to sell their stocks and bonds to a confiding public before the inevitable cataclysm occurs. False reports of utter ruin to the properties involved and of destitution of recuperative power in such properties may further depress prices in the sequent panic and empower the guilty concoctors to fill their safes with securities purchased at much less than their real value. "Between solid lying and disguised truth," writes Disraeli in his *Curiosities of Literature*, "there is a difference known to writers skilled in 'the art of governing mankind by deceiving them.'" While the commercial and financial classes of the United States contain many men of truth, probity, and public spirit, men essential to the perpetuity and prosperity of the republic, men of genuine Christian profession, it must be admitted sorrowfully that they contain other men whose skill in solid lying and in disguising truth is fully abreast of any that Machiavelli or Metternich ever displayed.

The virus is spread throughout the body politic. In party politics "forgers prefer to use the truth disguised to the gross fiction." Debates

on bimetallic questions, and on manufacturing, farming, and industrial interests, furnish ample material for illustration. Whether false reports, disguising the real condition of affairs, may "serve to break down the sharp and vital point of a panic," and to save the public "from the horrors of consternation and the stupefaction of despair," is scarcely worth a second thought in view of the fact that wilder panic and more stupid consternation follow the discovery that imposition has been practiced by those whose words were accepted as of solid truth. The panic-stricken are in danger of sacrificing sterling, as well as spurious, securities.

Recent history, especially of siege, battle, and military maneuvers, is rarely to be depended upon. The history of our late civil war in nearest approximation to complete truthfulness is not likely to be written within the next hundred years. There are too many individual and family reputations at stake to admit free and full utterance of all the facts. In war and in peace some men seek through published falsehood to reach their ends as architects in constructing arches support them with circular props and pieces of timber until they are closed and support themselves; then the props are thrown away. What is true of military, naval, and political lying is also true of professional, fiscal, and business falsehood. "There we may trace the whole art in all the nice management of its shades, its qualities, and its more complicate parts, from invective to puff, and innuendo to prevarication. We may admire [or be shocked at] that stupendous correction of a lie which they had told by another which they are telling, and single to triple lying to overreach their opponents."

Railway properties are strongly affected by this prevalent vice. Railroads have done more to develop the wonderful resources of this country than all other means of locomotion combined. They have changed the wildernesses of the West into fruitful fields, nutritious pastures, and blooming vineyards. They have opened the strong boxes in the Rocky Mountains and brought forth their singularly valuable metallic treasures. They have established fisheries, manufactures, trade, and commerce. They have diffused the blessings of education and abundance of earthly good. They have unified the nation and brought it into close proximity with older civilizations. They have been and are of priceless worth. They should be guarded with the most jealous and scrutinizing care. Had their directors and officials always been truthful, just, and unselfish, the benefits conferred could not well have been overestimated. Eternal, wise, active vigilance is the price of liberty. Without it what may be of untold benefit may become of unexpected injury. Railroad managers, in many and portentous instances, have infused the spirit and practice of falsehood into State and national legislatures, defied the administration of justice, partitioned the territory of the republic among themselves, built up wealthy monopolies, condemned thriving industries to decay and death, seized arbitrary and irresponsible power, exemplified the evils of luxury and of wealth illegitimately acquired, caused "speculative fevers and crises of maddening and universal ruin," discriminated unjustly in freight and passenger rates, given secret rebates, issued inflated stocks,

manipulated contracts, used subsidiary corporations to divert profits from the pockets of shareholders into their own, and have thereby unjustly enriched themselves. The welfare of the commonwealth imperatively demands that they be held to the strictest accountability.

In every department of ordinary social life the suppression of truth and the expression of fractional truth, of truth itself so as to produce the effect of a lie, or of positive falsehood issue from the faultiness and weakness of human nature and from the perversion of some of the finest qualities in it. The desire to please, to be on good terms with others, to profit by association, are all commendable provided they work with consistent regard to truth. Herbert Spencer quotes the ancient Egyptian Ptah-hotep as declaring that "he who departs from truth to be agreeable is detestable." Collective humanity reprobates flattery, and individual humanity, for the most part, lives in the application of it. Public speakers in legislative halls, judicial courts, and religious pulpits are often the subjects of insincere eulogy. Precocious children are complimented by bored visitors, beautiful girls by friends whose eyes are keen to detect moral deformities; books, poems, vocal and musical performances, works of painting and plastic art, by those whose judgment condemns the praise they bestow. Flattery crawls to win its goal by constant agreement with another person's opinions, and converts the flatterer into what Emerson distinguishes as "a mush of concession." Contemptible moral flabbiness is often revealed in testimonials to persons whom some of the parties thereto would gladly see lodged in a State prison. The recent case of a former railroad president is a probably pertinent illustration. Love of truth is not in all this, nor the desire to stimulate to worthy discharge of duty and fulfillment of all worthy obligations.

Of the fibbings, conventional falsehoods, and white lies disfiguring and vitiating social intercourse and common commercial transactions, it is enough to say that they are in jarring discord with the purity and beauty, the probity and healthfulness, of pure Christianity. Lies of the larger class—larger because their malign influence extends more widely through communities, civilizations, and the world—lies governmental, political, and diplomatic; lies mercantile and fiscal; lies corporate and managerial—impair private and public confidence, undermine faith in the veracity and beneficence of public men, wither prudent frugality and all the homely virtues, incite to wasteful extravagance, and vitiate the public conscience while they harden the public heart and spread the deadly malaria of moral rottenness wherever they go.

Lying is no new phenomenon. It is as old, or nearly so, as the Adamic family. In the devil—liar and "murderer from the beginning"—it made its first earthly appearance in Eden. Satan is the father of it, and has many children. He "abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." In mankind generally the love of truth for truth's sake, without reference to ends, is comparatively small and weak. In nothing does depravity, native or acquired, more painfully

exemplify itself. Numberless statements of assumed facts are wildly and willfully made that are wide of the truth, both in substance and color. Selfishness, seeking gratification, without thought or care for the rights and interests of others, is the sappingly corrupt source from which these noxious emanations spring. It is a versatile nuisance. Here it desires to inflict injury, and hesitates not at false witness; there, to gain unjust advantage, it purposely suppresses truth; and elsewhere it cringingly curries favor by saying what is not true in order to please. It is commonest—Herbert Spencer affirms—where people are subject to despotic, coercive rule, and where existence is aggressive and militant. On western prairies and Central Asian steppes, in Fijian islands and among contending African tribes, and quarreling aborigines of many lands, it is not regarded as wrong, but as a legitimate though cunning convenience. Among the ancient Hebrews it was more or less rife, but was never approved by Jehovah or his servants. Spencer does not overlook the “fact that in the writings of the Hebrew prophets, as also in parts of the New Testament, lying is strongly reprobated.” Had he said *all* parts of the New Testament, his confession would have been commensurate with the record. As scientists and as Christians, looking over the whole field of phenomena, fact, and force, we penetrate deeper into the spiritual world for the causes and occasions of these morbid manifestations than the limited scope of his inquiries will permit. Men who submit to Apollyon’s rule run aggressive and militant careers in the life which they construe as a pitiless struggle of each with all for survival and happiness.

Some tribes of savages, living in absolute tranquillity, or free from chronic hostilities with neighbors, are reported to be truthful; others, subsisting under conditions of militancy, are said to be quite veracious. With the first there are few, if any, provocations to deceit; in the second no irresponsible tyranny compels evasion or falsehood. Translation into modern social relations is said to evoke like modern traits. The ancient Greeks, whose mental and moral life cannot but be extremely influential upon the plastic spirit of youthful students, were nearly always, and the Cretan section of them “always liars.” Grote, who had studied them exhaustively, declares that they “were liars through all grades, from their gods down to their slaves.” In the Middle Ages the majority of men thought “perjury but a form of speech, not of crime.” The later French aristocracy “were without truth, loyalty, or disinterestedness. Neither life nor character was safe in their hands.”

The eminent missionary, Dr. Livingstone, remarks that “untruthfulness is a sort of refuge for the weak and oppressed,” and particularly when they are enslaved. The force of this generalization is obvious to students of modern times. The Russians are remarkable for extreme untruthfulness—a vice, among many others, that dissolves the cohesion and menaces the durability of their colossal empire. Egyptians pride themselves on successful lying. Hindoos perjure themselves in courts of justice without emotions of shame. How far removed from primitive savagery, from mediæval militancy, from phosphorescent—because

putrid—Greek morals, are crowds of newspaper reporters, “practical” politicians, astute lawyers, exchangers of values, and forsworn officials of every class? “‘I said in my haste, All men are liars,’” read a Scotch clergyman from his pulpit, and added, “Aye, Davie, hed ye lived where I do ye might ha’ said that at yer leisure.” This ancient story voices the sinking of heart, the weariness of spirit, and the bitter grief of godly men in presence of the world’s hollowness and fraudulency.

The first liar wrecked the first human lives by persuading man into the belief that God was not truthful, that coveted advantage would accrue from setting at naught his prohibition, and that the threatened harm would not result from disobedience. Eve and Adam quickly and remorsefully discovered that God is true, that the devil is a liar, and that lying, however fine the art thereof may be, is evil and ruinous only, and that continually. Admitting moral freedom, responsibility, and immortality to be attributes of mankind, and that its highest possibilities can be wrought into reality only through perfect adaptation to the changeless laws by which all things are governed, and which “make for righteousness,” then truth is an end to be pursued independently of seeming utility. “To be truthful and to do good,” as the virtue required of each and all men, is not only the saying of Pythagoras, but is, in substance, that of Him who is “*the Truth*,” and who does what the wise philosopher could not do, namely, points out the way by which perfect being and doing are attainable. The Lord Jesus Christ—God manifest in the flesh—the Infinite revealed under forms of the sinless finite, climax and crown of the Adamic race—and brother to us all, imparts knowledge of that all-perfect will which is the expression of all-perfect nature, endues the truthful soul with power to adapt itself to law, and through patient continuance in well-doing to lay hold on glory, honor, and eternal life.

This all-perfect will, expressing the unalterable order of the universe, is the basis of moral obligation. Actions, morally right, are done from sense of duty. Kant is right when he “insists that action done from affection or desire, or as the outcome of any constitutional instinct, is pathological and not moral.” Bowne is no less correct in asserting that “in the moral intercourse of a normal life truthfulness is an absolute duty; and to the truth we have a right. Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay. This is the ideal of social intercourse. Whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil and tendeth to evil. Language itself presupposes truthfulness; for without it speech would be absurd.” Normal moral order is the postulate of American society. Therefore, as Paley affirms, “a lie is a breach of promise; for whoever seriously addresses his discourse to another [as in the case of the railroad magnates under discussion] tacitly promises to speak the truth, because he knows that the truth is expected.” “It is the willful deceit that makes the lie, and we willfully deceive when our expressions are not true in the sense in which we believe the hearer to apprehend them.”

Lying, in all its Protean forms, is sternly forbidden to all responsible beings as irreverent and rebellious toward the Almighty (Lev. xix,

11, 12), as abominably evil, opposed to the solidarity of believers (Eph. iv, 25) and to the welfare of the liar (1 Peter iii, 10), and as certain of exclusion from heaven. "Without" in the burning lake (Rev. xxi, 8) is "whatsoever loveth and maketh a lie" (Rev. xxii, 15). In the realm of what is avowedly fiction nobody is deceived by language appropriate to it. In abnormal relations such as those existing in actual warfare, contact with madmen, murderers, and thieves, opponents have no right to the truth which they would only use in prosecution of their own fell designs. But in profound peace, under the government of wise, just, and equal laws, and in relations which imply and demand mutual confidence and benefaction, every man ought to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, with his neighbor. Not to do so, but to do the opposite, is a crime against God and against society.

Knowing and doing the truth to the extent of personal ability is essential to freedom from ill, to possession of good, to symmetrical and complete development of individual and social life. False reports, crooked accounts, clandestine combinations for selfish ends, and deceitful assurances are inimical to the whole welfare of men, individually and collectively. So keenly is this felt that we find falsehood sternly reprobated by nineteenth century civilization, and that "the social disgrace which follows convicted lying has powerful effect in maintaining general truthfulness." Veracity is the measure of civilization, and civilization in its best forms is the child of Christianity. The latter enjoins not merely the avoidance of falsehood, but forbids unnecessary concealment of essential facts, and positive unverified assertions. Its spirit and dogma aid the growth of industrial art and commercial exchange, while creating the conditions that favor their expansion. Veracity becomes the first virtue of the moral type, and no character is regarded with approbation in which it is wanting. It is made, more than any other, the test distinguishing a good from a bad man. We find, accordingly, that "even where the impositions of trade are very numerous the supreme excellence of veracity is cordially admitted in theory, and that it is one of the first virtues that every man aspiring to moral excellence endeavors to cultivate." In this virtue lies the chief moral superiority of nations pervaded by strong industrial spirit. Lying, and official lying in particular, is deadly to industrial, fiscal, and material progress.

Truth-loving men love truth for its own sake, and seek knowledge of it as indispensable to attainment of highest good. Their spirit is "one of the latest flowers of virtue that bloom in the human heart." Sincere love of truth implies earnest, conscientious, and unflinching pursuit of it and acceptance of results as certain to work naught but good to those who love and serve the God of truth. Thus only, through the intellectual activities attendant upon fearless pursuit, is moral status raised by the Spirit of truth, and that magnificent and complicated organism termed civilization advanced toward possible and intended perfection, in which railroad management and reports, among other things, will be entirely truthful—or at least veracious.

PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

ANTHROPOLOGY is a fundamental study. Whatever attention is given to those branches of inquiry which relate to geologic structure, or inorganic life, or stellar phenomena—and these are valid and honorable lines of investigation—it is necessary to know man before we can know the world. His supremacy in the creation; his racial distinctions and peculiarities; his military, literary, architectural, and religious achievements are the key to the story of mundane life. History is a limp and lifeless thing unless he be kept in sight as the central character upon the stage; we care nothing for the genealogical records or the daily routine of mollusks and pachyderms. Poesy seems almost a jingle of empty words when we forget the brain that gave the rhythmic measures birth. Invention deteriorates to a mechanical arrangement and rearrangement of wheels and levers unless we remember the human agency that conceived these mechanisms. Music, the science which has its application in celestial scenes as also upon the earth, degenerates to a chance combination of harmonic sounds if we forget the personality of the composer. In a sense all life centers about man; and to know him better is better to know the universe. There is no tribe of the remotest past in which the student as a consequence is not concerned; there is no individual for ages mixed with mother earth to whom we should not delight to turn as to an object lesson in the great story of humanity. The old aphorism of Pope, that “the proper study of mankind is man,” is instinct with eternal fitness of application. Anthropology, in a word, is the window through which the scholar looks out upon an intelligible and harmonious world.

Corresponding also to the need of anthropological study is its fascination. The charm goes hand in hand with the necessity; the great volume of human existence, albeit it is a serial not yet ended, never grows wearisome. We are always at home with the men whose traits we study. In the tropical forests, along the battlefields of Syria, among the Norse explorers; with warrior, priest, and potentate, we feel a sense of fraternity and find in their thinkings and doings some new teaching on the traits of universal man. Indirectly all lines of investigation followed in the schools are a species of anthropological study. Anatomy, psychology, philology, ethnology, political economy, ethics, are all but branches of the great pursuit. And that man is ever the subject under scrutiny, and the agent in the field of performance, gives new zest to our inquiry. For the time being we are even more interested in him than in the angels. His cowardice or his bravery, his clumsiness or his skill, his irreligion or his piety are not only responded to by the answering voices of our own souls, but help in the formulation of those universal laws we seek touching human life. So it is that men are always on the alert for archæologic discoveries. The exhumation of a new group of mummied Pharaohs in Egypt would be quickly telegraphed round the world. Every arrow head turned

up by the plow point has a welcome in the scientist's cabinet. Every Indian mound is a center of instruction. From all sources we are ever glad to learn of man; for man is the interpreter of himself, of life, of destiny.

FROM the Eastern world comes the ominous baying of the dogs of war. To say nothing of the martial demonstrations in Europe, trouble seems brewing along the Chinese-Russian frontier, involving indirectly the ownership of valuable territory and directly the superiority of these two great nations in the Orient. However remote the contest may be, should there come the actual clash of arms it will not be the strife of pygmies upon a petty stage. The two nationalities involved stand out with conspicuousness before the gaze of men. Each has its history of exploit and growth through accumulating generations. Each treasures its traditions of ancestral prowess, and hears the call of the departed from the heights to maintain the ancient standards. Each is fortified for war and, despite its musty traditions or archaic customs or despotic form of rulership, has millions of sturdy warriors to throw into the fray. Cossack and Mongolian, hesitant and sluggish, Greek-Christian and Confucianist, they sit opposite one another in vigilant sentinelship prepared for defense or assault. Yet the increasing disagreement between Russia and China not only claims our notice for itself—involving as it does the northern and western Chinese territories now in possession of the Russian staff, and the ownership of other vast Asiatic tracts—but for the important principle justifying warfare which is involved. Why, in other words, should Russia covet Asia? What justification has the Cossack for invasion, attack, massacre, or pillage in the land of the Chinaman? Is a nation, more than an individual, justified in envy of its neighbor's territory and in forcible disruption of those boundaries which time and the consensus of existing governments have granted to another? These inquiries suggest their own refutation. The moral law gives no license to nations which it does not grant to individuals. Governments are not irresponsible, if sometimes they seem conscienceless, agents in the commission of crime. Not all wars are justifiable. The unwarrantable appropriation of neighboring territory, though under the ukase of emperor, is simple and unmitigated theft. The wanton devastation of grain fields, or the burning of cities, is wicked mischief. The slaughter of noncombatants is open murder. How the great Judge of the earth is to visit punishment upon nations, beyond the chastisements of the present that sometimes fall from his hand, is not a matter of knowledge. But governments, which are but an aggregation of individuals, are under the moral law. Whatever Russia might be justified in doing under sufficient provocation, she is not excusable if in cold blood she march eastward toward the China coast. The claim that she needs additional seafront is not a sufficient reason for invasion of the Mongolian empire. Granted that all great governments must have a seaboard; that the Baltic, the Black Sea, and the Caspian are inadequate exits to the great deep for the Russian navy;

and that, as a thirsty hart pants for the water brooks, this interior kingdom, with its growing ambition, thirsts for the boundless ocean—yet in this is not a sufficient excuse for unprovoked invasion and theft on the part of Russia. If her location is in some measure inland she should rather be thankful for so much of the seacoast as fate has bestowed and make the uttermost of her opportunities. National grandeur does not inhere in wide boundaries. When will the nations learn that true greatness rather lies in freedom, industry, sobriety, education, morality, religion?

THE national Senate at Washington, in the special session now holding, has fairly outdone itself in inactivity. It is true that the charge of indifference to general interests is at all times easy, and possibly it is sometimes unjustly made by that watchful Cerberus over public affairs, the secular press; yet in the present instance the toleration of newspaper criticism has been unusual and far beyond the desert. Like every institution on the earth, the Senate must consent to be judged by its fruits. For rank and stilted conservatism, for unswerving loyalty to the old traditions, for the maintenance of a ridiculous magisterial dignity which is out of harmony with the times, and for persistent and masterful inaction history does not furnish a superior instance since the first Senate of Washington. Necessarily well aware, at the head center of information, of the financial stringency that has oppressed all sections of the land, of the languishing industries of our great manufacturing districts, and of the suffering of unemployed workmen, their answer to the demand of the nation for speedy action upon the silver question has been a gathering up of the robes of senatorial dignity, an almost sardonic belittling of the gravity of the issue, and a prolix exhibit of wordy oratory for which the nation has neither time nor patience. The not unfamiliar question has, under the circumstances, all the freshness of a new inquiry: Is not the quality of statesmanship depreciating? If in other days there went into our legislative halls those whose skirts were stained with venality, intrigue, or undue ambition, their number has certainly not decreased. With a proper understanding of our legislative history from the beginning, and with the remembrance of the jobbery and sale that have sometimes profaned our Senate chambers, we must confess our belief in the deterioration of the present. The exceptions to the rule do not save the criticism. In general the pseudo-statesmanship of the day is a grotesque exhibit. We have nurtured and called forth a brood of puerile politicians. Statesmanship seems gone to seed as the nineteenth century closes! What is wanted is not altogether an increase of intellectual force—though the best brain is needed to grasp the abstruse national problems of the day—but a renewal of the good old quality of patriotism. Statesmanship means the burial of personal interests fathoms deep for the common weal. Wherever in history a recognized statesman is found this has been his prime characteristic. Shades of the great departed, inspire those who play at legislation to the imitation of your virtues!

THE ARENA.

METHODISM AS AFFECTED BY RECENT BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

THERE can be no question but that many who are imbued with the evangelical spirit are very anxious in regard to the outcome of current discussions in theology. The Presbyterian Church, most conservative in points of doctrine, and thoroughly committed to a defense of the Christian faith, has been quite seriously disturbed because the gauntlet of daring criticism has been thrown down within its own communion, to be taken up by some of the ablest advocates of its recognized orthodoxy. Fortunately for Methodism, it has not been perceptibly jostled by these recent movements. It is not probable that the conflict, whatever the final issue, will permanently retard that phase of gospel aggression which strives to reform men's lives and character.

Methodism is evangelical, but it is liberal and progressive, and has never hampered itself with cast-iron *dicta* on matters to be determined by the scientific study of facts and phenomena. In present controversies the Methodist people are deeply interested in so far as the truth and reality of spiritual Christianity may be assailed; but the dispute, except in the temper of some destructive critics, does not immediately affect any of the principles which the Church preeminently promulgates. She has produced sound and able thinkers, who plunge into the thickest of the fray on their own responsibility; and their work will not be in vain. All progressive disciples will take personal delight in the investigation, though it is their chief business to induce the unregenerate to appropriate those revealed truths which scholars cannot question. It is better to suck the honey of the Gospel than to engage in a wrangle about the age and formation of the flowers from which the sweets are gathered.

One party in recent criticism has been endeavoring to show that some of the doctrines which the faithful cherish were uttered under other circumstances and recorded by other writers than those heretofore accepted. The facts and their importance are not denied, but merely the conditions under which they were revealed. While some distinguished scholars betray a lamentable ignorance of the experimental essence of the Gospel, and others are far from comprehending all the gracious possibilities of evangelical faith as taught and exemplified by the Methodists, many with whom the mass of the Church do not yet agree are deeply pious. They insist that the cardinal doctrines of the Bible are in nowise imperiled. Indeed, they place themselves on the Pauline and Methodist platform of teaching Jesus, only differing in employing high-sounding scientific terms, and claim that the faith must be Christocentric.

The Wesleyan bodies are second to none in their defense of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures in points of doctrine which affect the individual in his relation to Christ. In other matters, as, for example, in ecclesiastical polity, great freedom is allowed. The narratives in

both Old and New Testaments furnish valuable lessons, and, in whatever light they are viewed, are worthy of respect and credence for instruction in life and manners. The substance of revelation remains the same, no matter what were the names of the chosen prophets. The Grecizing of Schwartzerd into Melanchthon did not materially affect the essential features of the Reformation. A critical change in the order or number of the kings of Judah need not be revolutionary to the most orthodox conception of our Lord's Messiahship. Methodism has prudently sought to lay the foundations of its faith on eternal principles rather than on the incidents of historical relations.

We are often alarmed as well as annoyed when some of the processes and conclusions of our thinking are discovered to be faulty or erroneous. We much dislike, after a matter has received prolonged consideration, to be anticipated in our statements, and perhaps be required to modify established impressions. A state of uncertainty in matters that pertain even to dogmatic theology is to many minds distasteful. If opinions with reference to the outer structure on further examination are liable to change, may we not fear that the citadel itself is not impregnable? Yet we are not to distrust the infallibility of truth because our perspective of its external and temporary illustrations may be subject to alteration. If Methodism is to be distinguished for its life rather than its creeds, it will not be affected hurtfully by a scholarly investigation of the sacred records. An evangelical system lives in the present and holds the keys of the spiritual kingdom. The facts of practical regeneration, the comfortable witness of the Spirit, and the blessed privileges of a life fully sanctified are not staked on matters that scholars alone can solve.

Greencastle, Ind.

JOHN POUCHER.

DR. STRONG'S POSITIONS MAINTAINED.

THE matter is hardly worth a prolonged discussion, but the writer in the last "Arena," while substantially admitting my main point, has fallen into several inadvertencies and inaccuracies on my subordinate one.

1. My *addendum* was explicitly stated to be merely designed to obviate an impression liable to be derived from a remark in my main article, that Mrs. Adams's poem must be scanned as iambic measure, although I had not expressly said so, but only that it was probably intended as such. In that case it frequently substitutes a trochee for an iambus, and this not "in the first foot" only, but throughout the lines. This is anywhere acknowledged to be a "poetic license," and that of an extreme sort, because it utterly confounds the accent, which may be accommodated in reading or reciting, but cannot be adjusted in singing; and it ought therefore to be eliminated in a correct church hymnal. About this, it seems to me, there can be no reasonable question in scholarship, art, and good taste. "Blank verse," not being intended for music, is irrelevant to the subject. In no case can such violations of prosody constitute "pure iambic," nor did I use that term in this instance, but precisely the contrary.

2. I stated that the poem *might* be scanned as dactylic, and I adduced in proof the tune set to the words in our church book, which exactly tallies in its bars to the measure, thus: "Nearer, my | G6d, to thee, | néarer to | thée;" being three dactyls and an additional or catalectic syllable, a perfectly legitimate though rather infrequent meter; precisely like that of the hymn beginning, "S6und the loud | t6mbrel o'er | Égypt's dark | séa." This is equally certain and scholarly; nor does it "leave the fourth syllable hanging in the air," in any irregular or superfluous sense. The hymn beginning thus: "Bríghtest and | bést of the | s6ns of the | mórn-ing, | Dáwn on our | dárkness and | lénd us thine | áid," of analogous measure, has alternately two (a trochee) and one such added syllable. Many other specimens occur, consistently carried out through the entire composition, even in other species of verse. It is, in fact, a well-established principle in prosody, not only convenient, but pleasing.

New York City.

JAMES STRONG.

A HINT TO METHODIST JOURNALISTIC ENTERPRISE.

THE glory of Methodism has been her connectional institutions. These have enabled us to carry the cross to every part of this vast country, until it is a remarkable thing to find a county where the Gospel is not preached under Methodist auspices. But for the strong "tire" the great "wheel," with its rapid revolutions, must inevitably have gone to pieces. So we must never cease to thank God for our system of general superintendency, our General Conference papers, our publishing houses, and other connectional agencies. They have been indispensable in the past, and they will need no radical change for many decades in the future. Other denominations occasionally criticise us openly, while in their councils and under stress of exigent occasions they secretly envy us our plans. When we consider how much has been said in praise of our connectional system it seems only necessary to indorse the past and turn to something else.

Something more should be done to build up strong local churches in our denomination, or at least to strengthen and give prominence to the great local churches we already have. Here are some reasons why we think so: 1. There is a very apparent tendency in the population of the United States to centralization. 2. The life of this age is more studious and the thought of this generation is more intense than any preceding. The institution of to-day stands or falls by the character of its local representative. The high-school graduate, unlike the frontiersman of half a century ago, will not bear any kind of local preaching and make up what is lacking in contemplating the general glory of the denomination's enterprises. Ezekiel Jones's weekly ministrations in Centerville Church are far more important now than that Methodism produced by Wesley, Whitefield, Asbury, and Simpson. 3. The Scriptures are especially strong in their emphasis of the local church. The epistles of Jesus to the seven churches in Asia, sent by John the Revelator, show clearly that he is looking upon the great and small congregations, and is holding each respectively re-

sponsible for its character and work. 4. It cannot be doubted that there is a strong feeling in the ministry of our Church that our connectional offices are particularly elevated above the pastorate in position and honor. This we believe is largely due to the disproportionate attention of the press to these officials. There are hundreds, and ought to be thousands, of local churches in Methodism where the qualifications for pastor should be as high as those for bishop or missionary secretary.

In view of these and other facts we would like to see the attention of the Church, through her periodicals, especially centered upon the local church interests of Methodism, and connectionalism left to take care of itself for a while. Of course we mean more than mere local church items and announcements. Our Church periodicals have not been niggardly with space for such things. But we mean a systematic exaltation of the local church, and with it the pastorate. To our notion here opens a rich field. There is something in a great congregation's history, the architecture of its buildings, its distinguishing characteristics, its special enterprises, that would greatly stimulate the Church at large. Then the pastors who have been instrumental in gathering these large congregations and holding and directing them have such measures and varieties of gifts that the Church would be the richer for knowing them. And it is not only due these pastors, who have made the pastorate their lifework and have built up these phenomenal moral and religious centers, that the Church and world should know them; but it would be a strong incentive to younger men to qualify themselves for like great service.

We are not at present a pastor, and cannot be accused of any self-interest in these suggestions. We hope the above hint is not offensively strong, and not so elaborate as to deprive some enterprising member of our editorial staff of the credit of originality should he attempt to espouse the cause of the local church in some special way. In case, however, our press does not within a reasonable length of time meet this great want, let the idea above imperfectly elucidated be considered copyrighted by the author.

Albuquerque, New Mexico.

CHARLES L. BOVARD.

WHAT LIGHT HAVE THE HEATHEN?

ALL nations at some time in their history have had supernatural light sufficient to have guided them aright; and if they are without it now it is because they have lost it. This view, we are aware, is contrary to the generally accepted opinion of the Christian world. It is violently assailed by modern evolution, which holds that the present race of men are the product of blind natural law from rude protoplasm, through an infinite series of lower orders of animals requiring millions of ages for their development. This may be set down as rank infidelity simmered down to its lowest essence. The view held by most Christian Churches, that the heathen nations of the world are in possession of all the supernatural light they ever had, is a most dangerous concession to atheistic infidelity. It is a serious reflection on the goodness and justice of God to concede

that he withheld necessary supernatural light from three fourths of the race and conferred it upon the other little fourth, who were probably less needy than the unfortunate majority.

We are so constituted mentally that, if the alternative is to be set before us of a partial supernatural revelation to the race such as the major part of Christendom concede to be the fact regarding the heathen world, or to accept the atheistic doctrine of evolution, we must become an agnostic or an atheist without delay. But we are as certain that God has not been partial in the giving of supernatural light to all nations at some time in their history as we are that the Bible is a divine revelation to the nations that have it to-day. This proposition is, in our humble opinion, as susceptible of proof as that the Bible is a divine revelation. For several years in our early ministry we were on the borders of skepticism regarding this opinion of the moral state of the heathen so commonly accepted by the Christian world, and it was while on heathen ground in the years 1856-58 that our perplexing doubts were perfectly solved, to the great joy of our aching heart. But of course in this department of the *Review* there is not room for the discussion of our proposition, but only space for a modest challenge touching this interesting inquiry.

Spokane, Wash.

W. S. TURNER.

PRESCIENCE OF FUTURE CONTINGENCIES.

THE question of God's foreknowledge of future possibilities, notwithstanding all discussions, seems to be yet very far from a settlement satisfactory to all orthodox thinkers. Dr. Miley, in Volume I of his *Systematic Theology*, deals cautiously and conservatively with Dr. McCabe's theory of nescience, but still clings to the theory of divine omniscience.

In his treatment of man Dr. Miley maintains that God desired that Adam should not sin. He denies that it was the purpose of God to create such a being as would ultimately furnish a basis for the scheme of salvation. But we are not informed how the omniscience of God can be consistent with his desire for a free being who would not sin and with his failure to create such a one.

Suppose the theory of omniscience to be true. Then it follows that God knew that the creation of an infinite number of beings, similar to Adam in holiness and freedom, with like environments, would result in the fall of every one. Or he knew that there would be one, at least, who would not sin. According to a true method of science, if every one of an infinite number broke the law of God it would be inferable that they were created with an inclination so to do. If this is rejected as an implication against God it must be accepted that God knew that one, at least, would not sin. Why, then, did not God create that being?

The only way out of this difficulty, the only way which does no injustice to the character of God, seems to be by way of the theory that the future volitions of Adam were unknown to God.

Lincoln, N. Y.

H. C. BURR.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.**THE MINISTERIAL STUDENT—GOING TO COLLEGE.**

WHEN a youth has decided to take a full course of collegiate and professional study, and has made the requisite preparation, the next step is to decide upon the institution which he shall attend. On this point advice must necessarily be general; but, writing for Christians and those intending to be Christian ministers, some suggestions may be in place. The college should be a decidedly Christian college—not merely one that tolerates Christianity, but one that supports it. It sometimes happens that under the name "Christian" there is veiled a sentiment of antagonism to the peculiarities which mark an aggressive Christianity. A professor who sneers at sacred things, who treats with contempt the opinions of the fathers, whose religious convictions are counter to the formal acceptance of the general principles of Christianity, is not a suitable teacher for a youth about to enter on classical or scientific study. He lacks the convictions necessary for the best influence. The young men who intend entering the ministry are already Christian young men. They should continue to have the kind of Christian influence which will strengthen their faith and impart to them a vigorous, healthy Christianity. It is not desirable that they shall be placed in the midst of influences which will lead them to study their religion afresh; that is, to see whether they will accept it or not. They have already done this. The college should increase, not diminish, the strength of their Christian, and the intensity of their religious, life. By this it is not meant that the general tone of the institution should be narrow, bigoted, or intolerant, but that it should be decidedly Christian.

Furthermore, he should select a college which is known to give thorough instruction. The competition on the part of our American colleges in this respect was never more intense than at present. By greater facilities for practical experimentation, by enlarged curricula, and by increased faculties of picked men they are holding out inducements to the candidates for collegiate education. The quality of the scholarship imparted and insisted upon is the main point. The fame of the institution is not half as important as the quality of the work which is done. Its fame as an institution will finally rest upon the work accomplished and the kind of men and women it sends forth into the world. Some of the most successful men in every department of scholastic work have come from colleges unknown to most people until it was announced that these men received their education there. It is also desirable that the college shall maintain to a good degree the old curriculum, including Latin, Greek, and mathematics. We are not considering here whether Latin and Greek should be pursued by all scholars or, indeed, whether a thorough education may not be obtained without them. The advice here given is in view of the fact that those to whom reference is made are preparing for the ministry

of the Gospel, and will have it as their chief business to expound the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The New Testament should be studied in the original, and the foundation of the Greek should be well laid in the college course.

The environment of the student, both as to spiritual life and the kind of training received, is very important. This is in these regards emphatically the formative period. His tone of thinking is formed largely at this time. Some favorite professor, some valued friends among the students, shape and mold the life. The twos and threes who gather in each other's rooms to pray, to study, to argue, or to criticise are making each other's destiny. It is, therefore, far more than the mere question of scholarship which is to be considered in the selection of a college. Still more important is the question of religious, moral, and general intellectual environment. Hence the choice of a college is of the utmost importance.

THE STUDY OF ORIGINALS.

It is as important for the preacher to pursue the best methods of study as it is to select wisely the subjects which shall demand his attention. The methods vary in their adaptation to each individual, so that no general or absolute law can be laid down. They may have to do with the procedure in actual study or with the order in which studies or books are taken up. Modern critical books—indeed, modern books on important topics in general—are usually accompanied by the most important literature on the subject. The amount of reading necessary to compass this literature with thoroughness is appalling, and many shrink from the effort in despair. In their bewilderment the students ask: Shall we study many books or few? Shall we read the ancient or the modern writers on a given subject?

The answer to these questions will depend largely on the subject under consideration. If it be a purely scientific subject, old books are generally antiquated and can render comparatively little service; but if it be on a question of history or of thought, the older may be much the more valuable. And even in science the study of facts as they are found in nature is more instructive than the discussion of them, even by those best qualified to describe them. It is safe to say that the student should study originals as far as possible. He should study the earth's crust, in geology; the earliest philosophers, in philosophy; the originals of the great poetical and prose works. History, too, should be read in the original documents rather than in the revisions and adaptations of successive historical writers. The actual work of excavation in Greece and Rome is more fruitful of information than the study of many volumes describing what has been found there.

Of course, personal study in many departments is impossible, except to a few; but in history, in philosophy, and in theology the study of the great authors who have practically made their respective sciences is of the utmost importance. The study of Xenophon's *Memorabilia of Socrates*

itself, showing the methods of the great philosopher, will better repay the philosophical student than the study of the commentaries which have been written about it. There is no work on Bible history at all comparable to that contained in the Old and the New Testaments; no life of Christ so clear and full as that to be found in the gospels; no theology that, for clearness, force, and logic, can supersede the Epistle to the Romans. In an appendix to a discussion of the philosophy of Comte there is given a catalogue of works which are to be studied in connection with it. It is urged that these works be read without notes. There is something that is lost in the translation of great works, and also in the comments that are often made upon them. Mr. Froude, in his inaugural lecture at the University of Oxford, said of the method by which he had been educated: "For men who wished to improve themselves I believe it to have provided as good an education as was ever tried. We had certain books, the best of their kind and limited in number, which we were required to know perfectly. We learned our Greek history from Herodotus and Thucydides, our Latin history from Livy and Tacitus. We learned our philosophy from Aristotle, and it was our business to learn by heart Aristotle's own words—everything—every one of them; and thus the thoughts and the language of these illustrious writers were built into our minds, and there indelibly remain."

If this is the true method in the study of history, as one of its great authorities maintains, is it not especially true in the study of the Scriptures? They are written in Hebrew and in Greek. These languages are not difficult to master, or, at least, the difficulties are not insurmountable. The time spent in mastering the languages in which the word of God has come down to us is more than repaid by the enjoyment of drinking from the very fountains of truth and by the rich treasures of spiritual thought that can be found nowhere else. This also applies to the studies of any of the versions of the Scriptures. A special study of our English version, reading and rereading it, will be more helpful than any number of paraphrases and commentaries. Dr. Beck, in the introduction to his *Commentary on Romans*, says: "Even a commentary becomes a snare when the reader, instead of using it as a help to his own study of the Bible, seeks chiefly to know what a commentator says. The commentator is most successful when he writes so that his own words are forgotten and the sacred text only, but with greater clearness, remains in the reader's mind. . . . A man who has only an English Bible, but endeavors with all his powers to grasp its meaning, will do better than one who has the best commentary, but is too idle to think for himself."

"ALMOST," OR "WITH BUT LITTLE."—ACTS XXVI, 28.

(Continued.)

A PASSAGE so important as the one here under consideration should be considered not only linguistically but contextually, so that the fullest light may be thrown upon it. There are some texts where the original

language is so clear that there can be no mistake in the translation. Where there are differences as to the proper rendering we must resort to the context, so as to ascertain what was probably in the mind of the writer. Such is the text now under consideration. The translation of the Revised Version differs so widely from the Authorized that some explanation must be found for a rendering which has held its place so long, and which it is now proposed to set aside.

It has been shown already that the rendering "almost" is linguistically tenable. It is also consistent with the contextual and historical relations of the text. Festus and Agrippa, before whom Paul was brought to answer, represented different modes of training and of thought, although they were both in the service of the Roman government. Festus, a Roman, ignorant of Jewish modes of thinking and also of Jewish history, rejecting with scorn the idea of a resurrection, would naturally receive Paul's wonderful account of his conversion and of the resurrection with amazement. It was a line of thought which to him would be not only peculiar, but absurd. It was language which, in the view of the philosophical and scoffing Roman, no sane man would utter. Hence he said, "Paul, thou art beside thyself. Much learning hath made thee mad." It is easy to account for the impression of Paul's speech on Festus. Agrippa, on the other hand, was familiar with Jewish thought and Jewish history. To him the vision on the way to Damascus would involve no absurdity. It was in strict harmony with what had taken place before. He probably remembered the story of Moses at the burning bush, of the Hebrew children, and of Daniel. This would be to him only an added instance of God's manifestation of himself to his people. Hence, to Agrippa, Paul's address would come with force, and would awaken thoughts of God and duty which had long been dormant. It was to be expected that a man trained under the influences of Judaism would have received Paul's address in a far different spirit from one whose life had been environed by pagan thought. This would justify us in expecting him to answer as in the text, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Further, Paul's answer to the exclamation of Agrippa is evidence that he was conscious of having made an impression. Was it not the belief that he had touched the intellect, if not the heart, of the Jewish ruler that led Paul to exclaim, "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." It was this belief that led him to add, "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds." Paul was not unaccustomed to addressing hostile audiences; he knew by the countenances of those whom he addressed the impression he was making, and he felt sure that Agrippa, worldly though he was, believed the prophets.

The response to Agrippa's declaration is such as would appropriately follow the rendering of the Authorized Version. The whole incident, so far as the relation of Paul and Agrippa was concerned, was one of seriousness. We must also take into consideration Paul's oratorical powers. He had, on other occasions, powerfully impressed his hearers; why not at

this time? As before stated, it was far more likely that Agrippa should have been impressed than Felix, not only because the arguments of the apostle were calculated to impress him more, but because, in this case, it was a born Jew who had been converted speaking to one of Jewish training and antecedents. It is not strange, then, that Agrippa should declare, not with depreciating irony, "With but little," or "With little argument," but with genuine earnestness, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

STUDIES FOR THE QUADRENNIUM.

(Continued.)

THE constant demands upon ministers to preach and to deliver addresses on a great variety of subjects require a great diversity of knowledge and a thorough training of the intellectual faculties. The studies of the Conference Course have wisely anticipated this need and provided both for philosophical and for practical studies. The training of the voice is placed in the first year; logic and rhetoric in the second; psychology in the third; the philosophy of theism in the fourth. In addition, a written sermon or essay is required each year. In the department of practical work, while nothing is of small importance, we may emphasize the culture of the voice, the attainment of a good English style, and the development of the reasoning faculties.

Elocution is now regarded as very important. Its value consists not in following the method of any particular teacher, but in mastering those general principles which are fundamental to all correct speaking. This assumes the training of the voice and such general instruction in manner as will correct manifest defects. Its object should be the destruction of that which by habit has become a second nature and the restoration of the natural qualities of tone and methods. Some voices are harsh; they repel by their very mode of enunciating most important and valuable thought. Other voices are smooth, flexible, and pleasing. A rough voice may not be completely changed by study or training into a smooth one, ungraceful movements may not be transformed into graceful ones; but both may be much modified and greatly improved. Sweetness and melody may not be attained, but harshness and rudeness, as proven in many cases, may be removed by a successful teacher or by self-practice in accordance with well-attested rules.

The attainment of the art of expressing one's thought in fitting words and in a good English style is of the utmost importance. "A poet is born, not made," is a familiar adage; but that is not true of the writer. A good style only comes by culture and practice. Of course this can be attained much more readily by some than by others; but the accomplished writers have acknowledged that they became such only after great effort. The choice productions of our great authors have been written over and over, revised and corrected down to the minutest points. The study of rhetoric will lay the foundation; but the study of the mas-

ters of style and the most painstaking care are necessary to produce the required results. This is equally true of sermons as of purely literary productions. It is a mistake to suppose that the refinements of style are lost when employed in a sermon. The same thoughts are much more effective when presented in a pure English style than in loose and disconnected sentences. John Wesley's published sermons are many of them specimens of choice English, and may well be studied as specimens of English style. South has often been recommended to preachers for this purpose. Not that any writer should be servilely studied; but such writings serve to improve the taste and show the way to the improvement of one's own style.

The study of logic is also insisted on. Logic is the schoolboy's terror, and there seems to be a widespread dread of it. It is regularly buried by the students of some great institutions with stately ceremonies. It always comes to life only to be buried again or burned at the close of the academic year. It endures in spite of its unpopularity, because it is so necessary. Like mathematics, it is recognized by instructors as essential to a liberal education. But of what advantage, one asks, is the study of logic to a preacher? We answer, much every way. It produces the logical habit. It reveals the processes of the human mind. It shows that men reason, whether they are conscious of it or not. Logic is not intended to convey information, but to reveal the laws of the movements of the mind from one step to another. Assuming that a certain fact or principle is true, it shows that another fact or principle must be equally correct. The student of logic is the student of the laws of human thought and reasoning. It is a very effective training of the preacher in the analysis of his sermons. One who has been trained in logic is not only enabled to present his thoughts in the natural order, but he is able also more readily to detect in the Scriptures the train of thought of the sacred writers. The habit of consecutive reasoning which has been formed by this study will show itself in his sermons, giving to them at once progress and unity.

Assuming that the preacher knows the word of God, these practical studies will be of immense advantage in presenting it to the people. There is great power in voice; witness the voice of Whitefield, which produced such marvelous effects upon his vast audiences. There is power in style; witness the charm with which the pen of the late Dean Stanley invested his discourses. There is power in analysis; witness the outlines of the sermons of Adam Clarke and Bishop Butler. Whoever would be at his best in the pulpit should not neglect this practical portion of the preacher's studies. He must be a student along these lines as in other respects. The time has gone by when the cruder methods of earlier Methodism are practical or valuable. The time has passed by, if it ever was, when wordiness, rant, boisterousness, platitudes, inanity, sniveling, or "the holy tone" is of avail as means to the great end sought by the preacher of righteousness. In all lesser matters, as well as in the greater, he must be "thoroughly furnished" for the highest results.

FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

PROFESSOR DR. CARL KNOKE, OF GÖTTINGEN.

It would be interesting to give here the critical views of Professor Knoke concerning New Testament questions. But, since with him the practical is more weighty than the critical, we set him forth as he is. However, we cannot allow the occasion to pass without calling special attention to the fact that, although he is a thoroughly critical scholar, unfettered by tradition to such an extent that he feels at perfect liberty to reject the Pauline authorship of some of the letters usually attributed to him, yet he does not write for critical ends, but for practical. But of his practical views we can only have space for those upon church order as found in 1 Timothy and Titus. The Church is the congregation of the saints; but the Christian is still a human being, and his fellowship with the saints is a fellowship with human beings. Hence the necessity of external ordinances. This is not in contradiction to the freedom of the Gospel. But with circumstances ordinances must change also. Hence, it may not at once be assumed that the ordinances even of apostolic times are binding to-day. The bestowment of ecclesiastical offices has to do, not with the granting of dignities, but with the securing of proper servants of the Church. Yet the spirit is the same in all ages. Paul's commands concerning church order were self-consistent. The introduction of a mere novelty not demanded by circumstances renders all church order insecure and injures the usefulness of the ministry. This result is to be guarded against, not only in legislation, but also by giving to all ecclesiastical officers a clear idea of their official duties. Some of these thoughts are weighty in the extreme. We live in a day of ecclesiastical tinkering. Few church legislators are fitted for the profound study requisite to an understanding of the needs of the times. There is not the patience, especially among Americans, necessary to the growth of institutions. Ecclesiastical arrangements leave too much the impression of being a hodgepodge of the pet ideas of men who by their eloquence are able to command a majority. Especially does the hasty legislation of our own General Conference during its expiring moments give evidence of this lack of profound study and consistency.

ALBERT KLÖPPER.

A LEADER Klöpper has been ever since, in 1882, he gave to the world his great work on Colossians. His views of the book and its author will therefore be of special interest. After the most thorough investigation of the arguments for and against the Pauline origin of the letter he takes up the hypotheses which would divide the honor of its composition between Paul and certain unknown interpolators, and reaches the conclusion that the book has never been interpolated, but is a unit. Accept-

ing the Pauline origin of the book, he finds it written in the latter part of the first or during the second year of the Roman imprisonment, and the occasion for its composition in the representations of Epaphras concerning the doctrinal errors which were beginning to appear at Colossæ. These errors he characterizes as follows: The false teachers belonged to the Jewish-Christian party, and held firmly to the Mosaic law and its ritual of circumcision, festivals, etc. But they widened the law to include a rigorous asceticism or abstinence from the enjoyment of wine and meat—an asceticism, in fact, to which the ideas of clean and unclean, allowable and unallowable, in the law furnish no parallel. To this they added a form of angel worship, an intercourse with supersensuous beings, which we do not meet in such specific and extended form in the old Jewish theology. This angel worship and this asceticism are in organic connection with each other, and this connection is the result of a similar one in the later Jewish theology, and especially of the sect of the Essenes. To this Christianity naturally tended, on account of the ascetic practices of John the Baptist and of the permission to fast after his departure given by our Lord to his disciples. And in fact Klöpper finds generally prevalent in the early Church an ascetic tendency which is encouraged by Paul in 1 Corinthians and elsewhere. Indeed, it is this presence of Essenic asceticism in the early Christian Church which leads him to believe that Paul may have seen in the Colossian Church just such phenomena as are described in Colossians, and hence wrote the letter. In other words, the false doctrines were not later than Paul, as the opponents of the genuineness of the letter say.

KARL JOHANNES NEUMANN, OF STRASBURG.

NEUMANN has distinguished himself chiefly by his researches into the relations which existed between the Roman State and the Christian Church. And the principal service he has rendered pertains to the persecutions and to martyrology. His views relative to the trustworthiness of the *acta sanctorum* and other records of the martyrs will exhibit his thoroughness and at the same time illustrate the proper method of critical research. In order to get at the facts and test for himself the trustworthiness of the records he went carefully through the entire sixty-two volumes of the *acta sanctorum* and compared their contents with all other sources of information on the same subject. He thinks that the records during the early persecutions are generally correct. The Christians took pains to record the confessions and sufferings of the martyrs, and also the cowardice of those who denied Christ under persecution. He does not, however, assent to the truth of all that is recorded. In order to be trustworthy it is not only necessary that some of the expressions employed in them be those technically employed in the processes at law in the supposed period, but also that what is recorded shall not contradict well-attested history as found in other sources. This is a far-reaching principle. First of all, it requires that every such source of information

should present both positive and negative evidences of its trustworthiness. Again, it would exclude the exceedingly improbable miraculous stories so common in martyrologies. But it would not necessarily follow that in every case the whole story was invented; and Neumann allows that there are some records, whose details cannot be trusted, which still afford us much information concerning the sufferings of the martyrs. And even where the records are embellished with imaginary incidents they are not wholly valueless, since they afford an insight into the ideas and customs of the Christians of the period. For example, all the utterances of the martyrs were regarded as inspired by the Holy Ghost, because of Mark xiii, 11. Neumann holds, with most investigators, that there was no systematic purpose to destroy Christianity for more than two hundred years after Christ, and that then the Church had grown so strong that it could successfully resist even the almost unlimited power of the Roman State.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHRIST'S DEATH FOR HUMAN SALVATION.

THIS work continues to be the most important one in theology. In this old question Professor Dr. Ernst Kühl treats the subject from the standpoint of biblical theology. He begins with a study of the doctrine of the divine righteousness in the pre-Christian period. This he does chiefly by the aid of New Testament utterances. He finds that God's dealings with the race prove that his righteousness did not demand punishment for sin as a consequence of sin itself. The patience and mercy of God prevailed even when, according to his justice or righteousness, he must have punished. His final conclusion is that in both the Old and New Testaments the righteousness of God, as to its form, is that attribute of God according to which he acts consistently with reference to a fixed rule of conduct. As to its contents, the righteousness of God is his adherence to the rule which he has chosen for his own judgments. It will be seen that, according to this, the righteousness of God as revealed in the Bible is not absolute but relative. As to the anger of God, he denies its permanency. It is not an attribute of God, but a temporary manifestation. His permanent attitude toward man is love. The significance of the death of Christ is, first of all, in the irresistible influence upon the hearts of men when conceived as the highest revelation of his love. Because of this God could graciously accept it as an atonement for sin and guilt; as the redemption of a race amenable to punishment; as having a vicarious significance; and, finally, could graciously declare the law of works abolished and establish in its place the new law of faith, in order to give to him who repented of his sin the possibility of a new life—a life which is only in those who have the assurance that their sins are pardoned and their guilt washed away. We have here some new ideas concerning sin, atonement, and righteousness. He does not accept the old theories, yet he rejects their form rather

than their contents. And often it is the form of statement which, by its implications, fails to satisfy. He who can frame a definition of the atonement which shall at once hold fast the truth necessary to the heart and yet satisfy the reason will prove a benefactor to the Church.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

A WORK in English like this by H. A. Koestlin is much needed. It takes up the forms of worship in the different ages and branches of the Church and traces their origin, development, and significance. The author begins with the principle of worship in the apostolic age, which he defines as that of edification, order and propriety, reverence for tradition, and Christian fellowship. It is natural—the spontaneous result of the new life within—not the product of reflection. The subject of the worship is the congregation, not the apostles, and the object of the worship is the Lord himself. In the post-apostolic age there is very little change; but what there is points to the radical revolution which characterizes the form of worship in the period of the old Catholic Church. Even during this period, however, the principles of the apostolic age prevailed for a time, though they were finally and completely suppressed. The new principle which rose to the supremacy was the unscriptural idea of the priesthood of the clergy, which was nourished by the other equally false idea that worship was a sacrificial act, having worth in itself. This gave the worship largely into the hands of the clergy, and in so far repressed the activity of the congregation. As the Lord's Supper came to be regarded as an act of sacrifice the custom arose of dismissing all but the faithful prior to its celebration, with all the attendant modifications of belief as to grades and value of church membership. The Roman Catholic worship is not so much distinguished from primitive Christianity by its wealth of liturgical forms as by its inner principle. Primitive Christianity lays the stress upon worship as an expression of the feelings of the heart. Roman Catholicism places the chief value upon the forms of worship themselves. We cannot afford space to trace further the history of the changes of form and spirit in Christian worship. What we need for practical purposes is to clearly conceive and firmly maintain the primitive principle. But it would certainly be a mistake to suppose that nothing can be added to that principle or that no forms of worship may be employed except those in use in apostolic times. Those interested in church history give too little attention to these internal features of ecclesiastical development.

THE NEW TESTAMENT OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

RECENT investigations into the history of the canon of the New Testament make interesting the following points in the above-named work, by Dr. H. Eickhoff. The word "Scriptures" meant to Clement the Old and New Testaments. He distinguished both between the old and the new covenant and their respective records. The records of the Old and New

Testaments both fall into two parts: in the Old, the law and the prophets; in the New, the gospels and the apostles. The gospels are the traditional four; but the expression "apostles" includes a large number of apostolic and nonapostolic writings, chief among which are the writings of Paul, Peter, and John. The ideas of "apostle" and "apostolic" have a much wider range with Clement than they had later, and include Luke, Clement of Rome, and Barnabas, since he desired to make the traditions of the Church as thoroughly apostolic as possible, on account of the strength this gave the Church in its struggle with the heretics of the time. The ecclesiastical tradition concerning the Scripture, at Alexandria, even went beyond the idea of the apostolic and included such works as the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Although the canon of Scripture was yet uncertain in the time of Clement it included nothing which was not supposed to have been written in the apostolic age. Since the idea of the apostolic was not clearly fixed Clement felt free to use as Scripture such works as were not known to the Alexandrian Church, but which were known to the Church in neighboring countries. To Clement the canon was fixed, and he attempted to defend it against doubt, the very simplicity with which he speaks of the canon giving us the assurance that it reflected the current belief. That Clement proceeded along traditional lines is evident from the fact that he used a series of Old Testament apocrypha in close connection with New Testament documents. In all probability these stood alongside of his "apostles," and together with them formed a loosely connected whole. We have not space for comment.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERICAL EDUCATION.

A HISTORY of ministerial education, in the widest sense of these words, we cannot here give. We must content ourselves with a general outline of the progress of clerical education in the Roman Catholic Church. In the Carlovingian period the priests were only required to know by heart the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the prayers of the mass, and to be able to read well the gospels and the epistles of Paul. But while these were the requirements we know that there were those who had reached higher stages of learning, as Scotus Erigena and Alcuin. So far as philosophy was concerned the authorities of the Church were slow to accept the doctrines of Aristotle so long as they came through the channels of the Arabian philosophers. But as soon as the Greek copies of Aristotle fell into their hands they began to employ his methods for the development of the scholastic system. However, while we must respect the scholastic products of the Middle Ages, we dare not imagine that the educated men of that period were scholars in our sense of the word. They knew almost nothing of the Christian literature of the second and third centuries. They had no insight into the historical development of

the Church. A knowledge of the Hebrew was rare, and of the Greek unusual. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest teacher of the Middle Ages, confessed that he did not know Greek. The introduction of a thorough knowledge of language into theological education was brought about by the growing contact of the West with the Orient and with the Spanish Arabs. The more general study of the Greek language began with humanism, toward the end of the fifteenth century; and at the same time the influence of Platonic philosophy and of historical criticism began to be felt. The publication of the Greek New Testament by Erasmus and Ximenes gave the first impulse to a true biblical philology. Subsequent to the Reformation theological education in the Roman Catholic Church took a wider range. More attention was paid to positive theology; the history of the Church was more carefully studied, especially the antiquities of the Church; and the science of biblical introduction sprang into existence. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the historical and theological sciences were developed by a more careful study of the best methods of research and by a collection of materials necessary to a proper understanding of the same. This complete change in the theological curriculum led to the adoption of a new plan of study, which was first brought about in Austria and Germany. In 1752 Archbishops Trautson and Debiel projected a plan of study which included higher (dogmatics, Hebrew, ecclesiastical law), lower (ethics and casuistry), and middle theology (the various forms of biblical study, church history, polemics, and homiletics). In 1788 the course of study, which had continued four years, was reduced to three, and the first year was given up to the study of the Bible, church history, and patrology; the second year, to dogmatics and ethics; and the third to pastoral theology and canon law. It will be seen that that which is really new in the plan is the introduction of church history, of the history of ecclesiastical literature, and of biblical introduction. But even to this day the lectures on church history are not so prominent as to give a proper view of the development of the Church, even according to the Roman Catholic conception of it. Students of theology at Roman Catholic universities are also required to hear a certain number of lectures on philosophy. But it is ever kept in mind that the purpose of education is to fit the youth for the office of the priesthood. This is at once wise and unwise. It is wise because it trains men directly for their future work; it is unwise because it narrows their education and is liable to lead to the rejection of truth which cannot fit into the system they are to advocate and represent. The idea can only be safely carried out when a thoroughly liberal education has been granted prior to the beginning of the clerical education. Properly speaking, clerical education only includes those branches which have to do with the clerical profession, such as homiletics and pastoral theology. All other so-called theological studies, as Hebrew and Greek, church history, and dogmatics, belong in a preparatory course. They should be mastered under the most scientific instructors and be followed by the professional training proper.

SOCIETY FOR GERMAN CHRISTIAN NATIONAL EDUCATION.

THIS association of Christian people held its eleventh anniversary in Rheidt on June 1. During the year a large number of addresses were made and patriotic and church celebrations held in the interest of the work of the society. Small publications to the number of 196,778 were distributed, making a total during eleven years of 2,467,983. Among those printed during the year the titles of the following will enable the reader to understand somewhat of the scope of the work carried on: *The Christian Family a Fortress of Faith, a Spring of Love, an Abode of Hope; German Women and Maidens, Help; In Memory of Sedan; Trust in God—He Helps in Time of Need; The Self-evidence of Faith and the Self-contradiction of Unbelief in our Day; A Mighty Fortress is our God; To Us a Child is Born, to Us a Son is Given; The Redeeming Work of Christ a Fact; Social Democracy and Christianity; Come, Holy Ghost; To Arms against the Dangers which Threaten our People.* The society resolved in favor of a reduction of the number of saloons and a limitation of the right to sell on Sunday, in view of the growing tendency to observe Sunday as a day of rest from daily toil. Were they to argue like those who advocated the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday they would let the saloons alone and put the laborer back to his Sunday toil. They also advocated the necessity of frequent entertainments for all classes under Christian auspices and greater care on the part of teachers and parents to provide good reading for the young.

INCREASE OF THE DRINK HABIT AMONG ENGLISH WOMEN.

THE frightful increase of drunkenness among English women is supposed to be due to the fact that grocers are allowed to sell wine, beer, and spirituous liquors. During the twenty years since license has been thus granted the demon of strong drink has crept into many honorable homes, and the results are seen almost daily in the police and divorce courts. It is believed that the only preventive for this evil is to withdraw the license from the grocers. Many women who now purchase liquors without attracting attention and carry them home to drink would hesitate to enter a public house for the gratification of their appetite for liquor. It is said that the English government will bring this question to the attention of Parliament.

THE TURK AND THE CHRISTIAN.

THE Moslems feel instinctively that the growing influence of the Occidentals, with the widening network of railroads, the introduction of the telegraph, and other means of communication known to modern civilization, and especially the advance of Christian missions, threaten the very existence of their outlived and ossified institutions. Hence all manner of attacks upon Europeans and Americans living in their country. The sultan is unable to preserve order because he himself is opposed and denounced by those who oppose Christianity. Only when the representatives of a foreign government insist upon reparation for wrongs done its

subjects is he compelled to take cognizance of offenses against foreigners. Such was the recent instance at Marsivan. There a girls' school was burned down because on the walls revolutionary placards had been posted. It was done without the slightest attempt to ascertain whether the school authorities were responsible. The American consul examined into the facts and discovered that the chief of police of the city had with his own hand secretly attached these ominous placards to the school walls in order to excite the populace against the Christians. The consul secured the removal of the officer, and will probably secure financial reimbursement for the school. But vigorous measures should be taken by our representatives in the Turkish Empire, in order to deter the violent Turks from injuring our subjects and to guarantee them their rights in all particulars.

THE SUICIDE MANIA IN THE GERMAN ARMY.

It is announced from Berlin that out of one hundred and twelve deaths in the German army during February last twenty-two, or about twenty per cent, were the result of suicide. The vast increase in suicides among the soldiers during the past year is attributed to the severity with which they are treated by their superiors. Yet it appears that the military authorities impose but mild penalties upon officers who mistreat their subordinates. It is not likely, however, that the suicides can be rightfully attributed, in the majority of cases, to mistreatment. It is a part of the general situation in regard to self-murder in Germany. The barracks may, indeed, be the breeding-place for all manner of vice, but the cause lies deeper than this. The prevailing unbelief concerning the future, the pessimism which sees no hope for a betterment of earthly conditions, the effects of a civilization which, at its height, fails to bring happiness—these are the causes which lead to suicide in Germany among civilians and soldiery. He who can inspire hope in the masses of the Fatherland, both for the present and the future, is the one who can check this mania.

A COMMENDABLE FORM OF HOME MISSIONARY WORK.

In all European cities it is quite common to find considerable numbers of foreign females, attracted by the prospect of a livelihood as governesses or as servants. Particularly is this true of German girls, who are found in all the principal cities on the Continent. Nor is it unusual for such to find themselves out of employment for a season, and, as a consequence, without a home. That they may not fall into temptation "homes" are provided where they may temporarily reside at a merely nominal cost. Such "Homes for German Girls" have recently been opened in Florence and in Brussels. This work is not left to be done at haphazard, but is one of the regular departments of the German "Inner Mission" work. These "homes" are usually presided over by a deaconess, who takes all possible pains to provide employment for those under her care. It is one of the most blessed of all efforts for the rescue of those in danger and need. As a form of Christian endeavor it is far more popular with Romanists than with Protestants in America.

EDITORIAL REVIEWS.

SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

IN national finance, according to the aspect of the times, it would seem as if "money answereth all things." Nor can the intelligent mind deny the influence of a stable or fluctuating currency on a civilized people. Great results must be anticipated from the contraction, on the one hand, or the expansion, on the other, of the circulating medium. The experiences and apprehensions of the past few months justify, if they do not compel, profound solicitude for the future of our country. We have been brought face to face with a monetary crisis that would involve evils of no common magnitude. The facts make their appeal, not alone to the political economist and astute statesman, but as well to the thoughtful citizen in whatever position. The President of the United States, in view of the critical condition of affairs, has called together an extra session of Congress, and, in direct and forcible language, and with argument of such weight as should have borne down all opposition, discharged the obligations that his office imposed. When the excitement of the nation was such as to affect all classes and conditions of society, as if to produce a panic came the intelligence that Great Britain was closing the mints of India to the free coinage of silver. The reason given for this course was that "silver had fallen till the money of India, which is silver, had depreciated more than one third." The daily journals have freely discussed the situation, and the prevailing trend of thought shows itself in the ablest periodicals of the land, whether secular or ecclesiastical. The *North American Review* for September discusses "The Silver Problem" in two articles. The first, "A Word to Wage-earners," by Andrew Carnegie, presents the subject under the three heads: "First, what has happened; second, why it happened; and third, the remedy." The latter he believes to be the adoption of a single standard of value. The second article, "The Present Crisis," by Sir John Lubbock, advocates the same policy. The *Yale Review* for August, in "Comment," discusses "The Present Commercial Crisis" and "The Chicago Silver Convention." The *Andover Review* for September contains an editorial on "Congress and the Financial Exigency." May we not hope that true statesmanship and ardent patriotism will manifest themselves in the final action of Congress, and save the nation from evils which all parties should alike deplore and endeavor to prevent?

THE *Presbyterian Quarterly* for October presents a series of papers which are worthy of the closest thought: 1. "Illogical Methods in Biblical Criticism;" 2. "The Importance of the Tenet of Jure Divino Presbyterian Polity;" 3. "Sanctification the Necessary Consequence of Justifi-

cation;" 4. "God's Method in Divine Revelation;" 5. "The Church and Schools and Caliphs." The first article is by Edwin Cone Bissell. Its logic should carry conviction to the mind open to the impressions of reason. He clearly shows that those who "advocate the newer views of the Bible" do not reason "in harmony with the accepted rules of logic." In his view the critics of this class cannot support "their often asserted claim to be scientific." He boldly asserts that "Christianity and its true friends are the friends of free inquiry," and emphasizes the fact that the intelligent believer is such by virtue of the exercise of that freedom. He gives in the reasonings of the higher critics the fallacy of their "illogical assumption." When he shows that the criticism considered "fails to meet proper scientific tests" the sweep is so broad and the stroke is so deadly that candor can see but one result, the utter rout of the higher critic. The fourth paper, by Dr. J. E. Spilman, exhibits the divine wisdom displayed "in the great scheme of human redemption." That God did not "give to the world a complete Bible when he made the first announcement of a Deliverer" is explained by the fact "man needed a preliminary education." He needed experience to show his weaknesses and his wants. "Types and symbols" were the rudimental means of showing "vicarious atonement for sin." Yet no suspicion is allowed that the slow progress in revelation was the result of immaturity in the mind of God as to the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. The delay was from man's lack of readiness to receive a full revelation of the divine plan. Before the philosophers of Athens St. Paul considered it no disparagement of the Gospel he preached to say, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

THE *Yale Review* of August contains: 1. "Comment;" 2. "Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner;" 3. "The Historic Policy of the United States as to Annexation;" 4. "Edward A. Freeman;" 5. "The Tendencies of Natural Values;" 6. "The Behring Sea Controversy from an Economic Standpoint." In the second paper Professor George P. Fisher reviews the *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner*, by Edward L. Pierce, and presents a clear and discriminating estimate of the characteristics and achievements of Sumner. His "undeniable merits" are fully recognized; but, in replying to his opponents in the debates of Congress, Professor Fisher thinks that he "uttered phrases which might better have been left unspoken." A letter to Theodore Parker, written just before Mr. Sumner's speech on Kansas, shows, however, that it was not his wish to eschew such phrases, for he says, "I shall pronounce the most thorough philippic ever uttered in a legislative body." Mr. Sumner first wrote his orations and then committed them to memory. "As compared with Everett his style was pedantic as his culture was less correct and finished." Nor did he "succeed in giving to his delivery that close resemblance to naturalness which Everett was able to attain." "He never, or hardly ever, could be entirely simple and natural. It was natural to him

not to be natural. In other words, he was rhetorical to the core." The reviewer says, "With no wish to depreciate the merits of Mr. Sumner it is only just to say that he lacked the solidity and balance of judgment, the firm but temperate tone of Chase, the tact and humor of Hale, and the sagacity and somewhat excessive, yet often serviceable, prudence of Seward." Yet, says Fisher, "When all proper deductions are made the spotless purity of Mr. Sumner's character, his superiority to the allurements of flattery, his freedom from selfish dreams of ambition, and his unswerving faithfulness to the cause of human liberty, through good report and through evil report, entitle him to honor." The article is written with the candor of the true critic. The other papers of the number show the ability we expect from this quarterly.

THE *New World* for September has a fascinating paper by Dr. C. A. Bartol on "The Boston Pulpit: Channing, Taylor, Emerson, Brooks." He says: "Channing was in stature short and thin. Never had a figure so slight a presence of more weight. He was the center of gravitation for every company he was in, not by monopoly of the conversation or from being forward to speak, but because of a latent power and the expressive look with which he waited for what others, however humble, had to propose." In contrast he presents Father Taylor, the Bethel minister, who was "restless, quick, and playful as a boy, although in liberality with Channing twin." He was supple in body, alert in mind, impetuous in nature, and prompt to every recognized duty. He held every faculty in check at pleasure, but when the time came he would let "the stream of words . . . burst forth in a mellowness equal to its might." "The manner of Phillips Brooks was no less peculiar and distinct. Planted firm, not moving, but like a pillar on his feet, from every lineament and gesture and pore of his skin he poured out his message with an astonishing rapidity, his tongue like a bubbling spring." "Channing was a reflective, Taylor an imaginative, and Brooks an emotional man. Like the sundial, Channing numbered no hours that were not serene. He said that Taylor had Plato's idea of wings. Rather what Taylor had was the actual wings." "For native ability among those I am celebrating," says Dr. Bartol, "Taylor ranks first," and he adds, "The land has not borne a genius more rare nor listened to an eloquence more real and pure. In the sphere of religion he bore the palm." "A sailor says he has been where the United States had not been heard from, but not where Father Taylor was not known." The contrast between Taylor and Emerson was very sharp. "Emerson scarce stirred in his posture and was never at white heat. He sprinkled water on his forge and used the flame for the substance that he wrought." Space will not allow us to do more than to deprecate the influence of the article in this same number, "The New Unitarianism," by Edward H. Hall. Our knowledge of the earlier Unitarians of this country made them dear to us, and we are sure were they living they would mourn the position that the New Unitarianism assumes.

The other articles are: "Ernest Renan," by James Darmesteter; "A Way Out of the Trinitarian Controversy," by James M. Whiton; "The Relations of Religion and Morality," by Wilhelm Bender; "Jesus's Self-designation in the Synoptic Gospels," by Orello Cone; and "The Rôle of the Demon in the Ancient Coptic Religion," by E. Amelineau.

THE *Andover Review* for September contains: 1. "The Supernatural;" 2. "Historical Presuppositions and Foreshadowings of Dante's *Divine Comedy*;" 3. "An Elizabethan Mystic;" 4. "Sunday in Germany;" 5. "Recent Theosophy in its Antagonism to Christianity." In the first paper Dr. Chauncey B. Brewster would eliminate from Christian terminology the word "supernatural," as not found in Scripture and as not necessary in our teaching of truth; but where is there a substitute? Is religion as an experimental fact, or vital religion as required of God, in nature, or is it above nature, and in the *divine*? And are miracles and prophecy the product of man or of God? Is heaven higher than earth, or is being "born from above" any more than being born of flesh and blood? Accommodations to prejudice can never be allowed at the sacrifice of *truth*. And there is much terminology not found in the Bible that, because of the thought it best conveys, wise ecclesiastics and thoughtful men should be slow to abandon. The fifth paper exhibits Madame Blavatsky as the high priestess of theosophy. Certainly there is little in her history to give influence to her teaching. For the breadth of its information and the force of its reasoning the article is one to command the thanks of all Christians.

BESIDES the articles before mentioned the *North American* contains: "The Political Situation," by ex-Speaker Reed; "England and France in Siam," both from English and French points of view; "Polar Probabilities of 1894," by General Greely; "The House of Lords and the Home Rule Bill," by the Earl of Donoughmore; "The Wealth of New York," by Mayor Gilroy; "Christian Faith and Scientific Freedom," by Rev. J. A. Zahn; "Playwriting from an Actor's Point of View," by W. H. Crane; "Counting Room and Cradle," by Marion Harland; "The Lesson of Heredity," by Dr. H. S. Williams; with shorter articles upon "The South Carolina Liquor Law," "The Briggs Controversy from a Catholic Standpoint," and "Needed Prison Reforms." This is a varied and attractive list which will speak for itself.

THE *Fortnightly Review* for September devotes considerable space to European affairs. The silver question in England and British interests in Suez and on the Persian Gulf are discussed in three articles, and a contrast of French affairs in 1793 and 1893 is presented by Albert D. Vandam. We especially note an article entitled "Immortality and Resurrection," which infers that burial is the result of a belief in the resurrection of the body, while cremation anticipates its annihilation. "Passages

from an Autobiography" consists of quotations, with comment, from the manuscript life of Humbert Thompson, who was a Presbyterian minister in Ireland during the close of the eighteenth century.

Our Day for August and September. This "Record and Review of Current Reform" lacks neither purpose nor point. The contents of these issues show vigor of mind and determination of purpose, and are not without those attractions of style that hold the thought to the theme discussed. The first article in the September number, "The Divine Program in the Dark Continent," by Joseph Cook, is a thoughtful and weighty exhibition of facts that must make a powerful appeal to the Christian, the philanthropist, and the statesman. The problem in which providence must have so large a place will find its solution in a way that the present may not predict. The "Editorial Notes" should be wisely pondered.

The New Jerusalem Magazine for September. In this we see the earnest spirit to advance the "New Church" that expresses the conviction of a mind full of its subject. Sincerity is a power. Where we differ we can admire. Goodness, whenever found, exerts its influence, and true love to God and souls will find its reward.

The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for September. We could wish to dwell on some of the many interesting and vital subjects presented in this number. Such are: "Singularity," a sermon by John H. Goodman from the words, "So did not I, because of the fear of God;" "The Doctrinal Uses of Church Discipline;" "Methodism in the Middle of the Century;" and "'Theology in Transition' and the Bible in 'Suspense.'" "Good-bye to the Editorship" is a pathetic paper. He who, following such able men as Joseph Benson and Thomas Jackson, retires after a service of twenty-five years, must justly feel all that he expresses in his farewell issue. It is stated that the late Dr. Peabody said, when he gave up the *North American Review*, after what was deemed a very successful editorship of several years, that "he had made as many enemies as he could endure for the rest of his natural life." That the retiring editor of the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, Dr. Gregory, should have filled his responsible post for so many years must be the strongest evidence that his conduct has made many lifelong friends.

The Missionary Review of the World for September and October. This periodical is devoted to the grandest cause that ever enlisted the human heart and brain, the salvation of men. It is at once a means by which missionary seed is sown and the missionary growth and harvest are reported. We commend the conduct of those having charge. Its "Editorial Correspondents" make such contributions as meet the wants of all who seek to advance the cause of missions.

THE *Homiletic Review* for September and October brings together many articles of variety, beauty, and weight. The devout minister must find in these numbers that which cannot fail to be of great value to him in his preparation for the pulpit. In the September number "The preacher and the Lecture Platform" furnishes Bishop Vincent an opportunity of which he makes royal use.

THE *Methodist Magazine* for September contains much that instructs and pleases. The titles of the following articles suggest how interesting they are: 1. "Tent Life in Palestine;" 2. "The Sea of Tiberias;" 3. "India: Its Temples, its Palaces, and its People." Helen Campbell writes a very helpful article for the Christian beset by difficulties, entitled, "Light in Dark Places."

FOR varied matter, interesting themes, and adaptation to cultivated taste the *Chautauquan* for October exhibits its accustomed excellence. We can hardly examine this issue without admiration for the skill of its editor and the bountiful supply of living subjects.

THE *Nineteenth Century* for September contains much that is invigorating to the mind. In "'Protestant Science' and Christian Belief" Canon Knox Little protests against the effort now being made to stop the teaching of the Apostles' Creed in English schools. "A New Stage Doctrine," by Hamilton Aidé, and "Poaching," by L'Aigle Cole, deserve attention. A glance at "American Life Through English Spectacles" instructs, for we "see ourselves as others see us."

THE *Treasury of Religious Thought* for September. Here the *spirit* as well as the "thought" is "religious." The heart is in the work, and the subjects commend themselves. It is, indeed, a "Treasury" upon which the Christian minister or layman may daily draw to quicken his intellect and enrich his moral nature.

Worthington's Illustrated Magazine for September. This "Monthly Journal for the Family" accomplishes what it attempts. In depicting human nature it is vivacious and pleasing. The ninth of a serial of ten papers appears in this number, entitled, "In 'Ole Virginny'—Fifty Years Ago." The title explains the article, and the paper gives insight into the conditions that make up the Virginia of to-day.—The *Biblical World* for August. Among the many papers of deep import we note especially "The Hebrew Doctrine of Future Life," by Professor Milton S. Terry. He states that while in their fullness life and immortality are brought to light through the Gospel, yet we find in the Old Testament enough to inspire confidence in the supreme bliss of a future state.—The *Contemporary Review* for September has, among its many weighty subjects, "A Reply to Herbert Spencer," by Professor August Weismann, entitled "The All-Sufficiency of Natural Selection." It is learned and convincing.

BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES.

AMONG THE HEIGHTS.

THE graduate of Oxford who wrote *Modern Painters*, preparing once for crossing the Simplon Pass, put into his carriage M. Viollet-Leduc's *Massif du Mont Blanc*, and, riding slowly upward in the rain, shut in by clouds among mountain pines with films and shreds of white mist braided and tangled among their dark branches, he read. Finding the book full of false confidence, conceit, and fallacy in its theories of the construction of the Alps, he threw it wearily aside and took up Cary's Dante, which, he says, "is always on the carriage seat or in my pocket—not exactly for reading, but as an antidote to pestilent thoughts and things in general, and store of mental quinine—a few lines being usually enough to recover me out of any shivering marsh fever fit brought on among foulness or stupidity." He read on eagerly in the great book with the result of a rescued mind and a pacified spirit, until the close clouds broke apart and strong light poured through the carriage windows into his face so bright that it waked him like a new morning from his Dante's *Paradiso* trance, and he looked out to behold through the alternate arch and pier of glacier galleries the view of the southern side of the Bernese range from the Simplon, which the pen that is a painter's brush thus describes: "The whole valley below was full of absolutely impenetrable wreathed cloud, nearly all pure white, only the palest gray rounding the changeful domes of it; and beyond these domes of heavenly marble the great Alps stood up against the blue, not wholly clear, but clasped and entwined with translucent folds of mist, traceable, but no more traceable than the thinnest veil drawn over St. Catherine's or the Virgin's hair by Lippi or Luini; and rising as they were withdrawn from such investiture into faint oriflammes, as if borne by an angel host far distant; the peaks themselves strewn with strange light, by snow fallen only that moment—the glory shed upon them as the veil fled—and intermittent waves of still gaining seas of light increasing upon them as if on the first day of creation." And there between the double sublimities of the great mountains and a great book, among the heights of the mind and of the earth, he recovered tranquillity from the perturbing effects of the insolence of pretentious ignorance and the folly of dogmatizing pedantry.

From most human habitations the Alps are far away, but the humblest library may have some of those sublime immortal books which loom and abide like mountain peaks. To dwell lifelong with some such books is the first necessity—to build one's *chalet* on their sheltered slopes, to climb the sheer steepness of their Jacob's ladders, to creep on hands and knees along their dizzy, sharp *arête*, to scale the last splintered *aiguille* that farthest pricks the sky and take there, breathless with awe and thrilled with ecstacy, the vast vision that lies within the stretched horizon, till we fear and hope that the heavens are about to claim us and the earth is letting

us go. After the imperative and perpetual need of such great books the thing of second importance is some acquaintance with the literature of the hour, the newest books, whose permanence no man can yet determine, but which give the world's freshest thought; such, for example, as *Verbum Dei*, by R. F. Horton; *The New Era*, by Josiah Strong; *The Life of Catherine Booth*, by F. De L. Booth-Tucker; and *A Short History of the English People*, by J. R. Green.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Theology of the Old Testament. By CH. PIEPENBRING, Pastor and President of the Reformed Consistory of Strasburg. Translated from the French, by Permission of the Author, with Added References for English Readers, by H. G. MITCHELL, Professor in Boston University. 12mo, pp. 361. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

If it be true, as we thoroughly believe, that each generation must write its own books in pretty nearly every department of human thought and learning, then most emphatically in the department of biblical study is there call for fresh contributions to our library shelves. Changes and progressions of thought go forward as the Bible, and especially the Old Testament, is viewed from new standpoints and studied in fuller light—light which cannot discredit the Book, although it may alter some theories and interpretations; for, when all possible light has been turned on, the holy volume will only be the more clearly seen to stand stable and unmoved. The theology of the Old Testament has undergone various writings and re-writings by scholars in successive centuries, and our own generation, like its predecessors, tries its hand at an improved reconstruction, which is held by many to be necessary, and which doubtless in every age will be possible, since, while the Bible is of God, the theologies built upon it are of men, and the thoughts of men may widen with the circling of the sun. M. Piepenbring makes his attempt with the design of satisfying those who are anxious first of all to have the exact truth, and next to have this truth so presented and guarded against misconception that it shall not disturb the faith of the Church, or impair that supreme reverence for the sacred book which it would be the greatest of all calamities to lose. The author, while clearly apprehending his duty as an impartial historian to set down the precise facts just so far as the most thoroughgoing scientific and historical investigation shall disclose them, has also kept steadfastly in view the interests of faith; and he takes special pains to show that, though a strictly historical method must be rigidly pursued if we would avoid erroneous views, nevertheless the religious value and authority of the book will not be thereby impaired. He shows a constant care to avoid that lamentable divorce of faith from truth which would degrade the former into superstition and link the latter with unbelief. His claim is that only a false faith, that faith which is the product of Jewish rabbinism and unintelligent dogmatism, can be injured by accepting all the facts which the most critical study brings to light. True faith, faith in the Bible sense, he declares is not "faith in

the sacred letter, but faith in the manifestation of God in history in his interference in the world with a view to the salvation of humanity, faith in the living word inspired by the divine Spirit in the prophets, faith in the holy mission of these men of God." And this faith, which is founded on evident and undeniable facts, cannot, of course, be injured by them. He believes that the Bible has a human side, as well as a divine, perfect, unchangeable, eternal side. He recognizes that the one exists as well as the other, and treats the volume accordingly. The results of this method of treatment, if it be applied by capable and evangelical scholars in the proper devout and reverent spirit, will more and more justify themselves to all truth-loving minds. This book is remarkable for the clearness of its style and the symmetry and convenience of its arrangement. The work is divided into three periods. The first reaches to the beginning of the eighth century B. C., and is characterized chiefly by Mosaism. The second extends from the appearance of the oldest prophetic books to the end of the exile, and is marked by the predominance of prophetism. The third, from the exile to the first century before the Christian era, is the age of Levitism, when the written law and the priesthood had such extraordinary influence. In each period are treated the questions for the time being most prominent; and thus when the treatise is concluded a complete survey of the theology of the Old Testament has been presented. Among the topics discussed are: "The Idea of God," "The Names and Attributes of God," "Creation," "Providence," "The Covenant of Jehovah with Israel," "The Manifestation of God in the World," "The Nature of Man," "The Dignity of Man," "Origin," "Extent," and "Guilt of Sin," "The Messiah," "Angelology," "Demonology," "Death and the Future Life," "Forgiveness," "Atonement," "Ethical Life." On all these and many other subordinate subjects the author exhibits a scholarly endeavor to fairly interpret the Scripture texts and, without reference to the bearing of the conclusions on theological systems, impartially to set forth just what were the ideas of the ancient Hebrews and the more modern Jews. Evidently a work of this kind is indispensable alike to the Bible student and the theologian, since biblical theology has the closest possible relations with both exegetical and systematic theology, and is the foundation of historical theology as well. Professor Mitchell has done the Christian thinkers of America good service in introducing to their notice this excellent volume in so admirable a translation. We shall await with interest the companion volume on the theology of the New Testament which is promised. For it is around the New Testament mainly, around the person and teachings of Jesus Christ, that the chief battle of the ages has hitherto been fought and still must be waged.

The Bible: Its Origin, Growth, and Character, and its Place Among the Sacred Books of the World; together with a List of Books for Study and Reference, with Critical Comments. By JABEZ THOMAS SUNDERLAND. 12mo, pp. 299. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

We are genuinely sorry that we cannot give this book by any means unmixed commendation, for with much that there is in it we feel full

sympathy. A great deal of truth that needs to be uttered is set forth by the author with wonderful clearness and force, for he has gathered up, carefully digested, and packed into small compass the ripest results of the researches of the ablest scholars of the present generation, both in the Old Testament and New Testament fields of study. A portion of the book is worthy of all praise, but the other portion must just as emphatically be censured. For the writer goes over so distinctly to the extreme rationalistic side of the biblical controversies, and is so decidedly destructive rather than constructive in his tendencies, that we must deplore what will unquestionably be the evil influence of the volume as a whole. Its dedication to Wellhausen, Kuenen, and other similar spirits somewhat prepares the reader for what he finds in many of its pages. The Bible is regarded as merely one of the six or eight sacred books of the world, in no respect distinguished in kind from the rest, although, of course, having a higher degree of excellence. Everything that is supernatural is summarily, if not flippantly, ruled out as mere legend and myth, to be classed with the similar stories that cluster around the beginnings of all religions. The Bible is not regarded as containing inspiration or revelation of any different sort than is found in other books of both ancient and modern days. Nay, Jesus himself is considered to be simply "the best moral and spiritual product of that old world from which all our great religions have come;" "the race has produced but one Jesus." The "birth stories" and "wonder stories," as they are called, which Matthew and Luke relate, are classed with "similar stories which have gathered round the birth of so many other great characters of history." And the miracles are treated as mere representations of a credulous age. Jesus was merely a man, according to Mr. Sunderland. His "simple humanity," which is found depicted in the earliest of the gospels, Mark, has become exalted into "something superhuman" in the gospel of John, which is supposed to have been written by some unknown person with a polemic purpose far down in the second century. "The journey of Jesus from man to God," remarks the author, "does not end until the Council of Nicaea in the year 325; but by the time the fourth gospel is written it is far advanced." This will suffice to show the thoroughly rationalistic standpoint of the book. Its writer is an uncompromising, not to say unscrupulous, foe to supernaturalism, and hence, of course, to truly Christian scholars must remain a wonder and an aversion. The book is dangerous to the average reader, because it slips in so slyly very much that it seems reluctant to state openly, and because, while it avoids frightening by blunt and coarse attacks, it certainly insinuates, and logically leads to, conclusions utterly destructive to all faith in Jesus Christ. It avows itself a friend of the Bible and of religion and morals. It claims that all its blows against the supernatural are given in the interests of virtue and truth. We are not disposed to sit in judgment on the motives of the author; but the adroitness with which a great deal more is suggested than is plainly printed, and the skill with which much is implied which he evidently feels the reader may not be fully ready to have boldly declared, do not impress us favorably.

He professes to be actuated simply by a desire for truth. "Men are obliged to believe that two and two make four," he says; "they cannot believe differently, no matter how much they may wish it." Very good. We say the same most emphatically. But we distinctly note the fact that he has not given us any theory of Jesus or of Christianity from a purely rationalistic basis which succeeds in explaining the admitted facts. We have a right to complain of him for thus ruthlessly tearing down and showing no concern as to building up. We are justified in declaring that on his theory he cannot explain the appearance of Jesus or the rise of his religion. No one has ever been able to do it, and we are confident no one ever will; and until somebody does it—until somebody tells us how it came about that such a being as Jesus, confessedly unsurpassed in these nineteen centuries, came out of that obscure Galilean village as a product of that rude age, and how it came about, if he was only a crucified Jewish carpenter never rising from the dead, that his pierced band has so turned the course of history from its channels, and that from his cross he has so ruled all the subsequent years—we shall hold to the old Gospel and believe in the old faith. It is all very well to assert that two and two must make four; but it seems to us like saying two and two make five for Mr. Sunderland to tell us that some nobody, about the year 140, or later, more than a century after Jesus died, evolved from his own inner consciousness, as a mere battle-ax in a theological dispute of that age, the marvelous discourses that fill the fourth gospel, and which on this theory were never dreamed of either by Jesus or his immediate followers. No. That makes altogether too large a claim on our credulity. We have some scanty remains of the undoubted writings of the church fathers in that century and the century following, and those of themselves are enough to convince us that chapters fourteen to seventeen of John do not belong in such company, even as we are altogether unable to believe that Jesus Christ was a mere human product of his age. It would seem as though a man must wish this very much in order to bring himself to believe it. To us it seems axiomatically clear that no one can have rightly studied him, with devout heart and unbiased mind, without heartily assenting to the truth of the words ascribed with high probability to Napoleon: "I know men, and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man. Superficial minds see a resemblance between Christ and the founders of empires and the gods of other religions. That resemblance does not exist. There is between Christianity and whatever other religions the distance of infinity."

Verbum Dei: The Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1893. By ROBERT F. HORTON, M.A., Author of *Revelation and the Bible*, etc. 12mo, pp. 300. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

We have read with the deepest interest every word of this remarkable book. For originality, eloquence, and spiritual quickening it has not been surpassed for many a year. In the literature of homiletics it is absolutely unique in its theme, if not in the freshness, force, and beauty with which that theme is treated. The theme is this: "Every living

preacher must receive his message in a communication direct from God; and the constant purpose of his life must be to receive it uncorrupted and to deliver it without addition or subtraction" (p. 17). What a conception this is! It makes the preacher the veritable successor of prophets and apostles. The realization of this ideal in the life of every minister would revolutionize the world in a generation. The lecturer makes good his thesis. This direct relation of the minister to God does not exclude, but makes indispensable, the ordinary methods of learning the divine messages. The most strenuous study of the Bible is especially necessary. Every preacher should buy this book, if only to read the two chapters, "The Bible and the Word of God," and "The Word of God Outside the Bible." Mr. Horton has laid the clergy under profound obligation by this luminous and inspiring treatise. The reading of it will mark an epoch in the spiritual history of every man who takes it up. And, once begun, it cannot be laid aside until it is finished.

Illustrative Notes. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday School Lessons for 1894. By JESSE LYMAN HURLBUT and ROBERT REMINGTON DOHERTY. 8vo, pp. 396. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. Price, cloth, \$1.25. To clergymen and teachers, for cash, 75 cents.

This book for the use of pastors and teachers contains Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Practical Applications, Archaeological Notes, Library References, Maps, Pictures, Diagrams, etc. In the way of comment each lesson has about seven pages of explanation, scholarly and careful, but written in easy, popular style, derived from the most eminent commentators, and intended to throw the utmost possible light on the dark places of the text. Dr. Doherty's "Illustrative Notes" are rich in variety and apt in pertinency, giving brief, pointed, and effective application to the truths of the lesson. Dr. Hurlbut renders great assistance to teachers in his answers to the question, "How shall I go at that lesson?" There are over fifteen hundred anecdotes and illustrations from a wide range of life and literature, helping to make the truth vivid, impressive, and memorable. The engravings are numerous and excellent. The book is an indispensable aid to Sunday school work for 1894. It is what might be expected from a brace of experienced, scholarly, and judicious editors.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The New Era; or, The Coming Kingdom. By REV. JOSIAH STRONG, D.D., Author of *Our Country*. 12mo, pp. 374. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 30 cents.

The author of *Our Country* could hardly write a common book, and the expectations raised by his previous venture for popular favor have been fully met in its successor. He takes the nineteenth century as the point of view for the discussion; and a close and accurate historical investigation introduces and emphasizes his argument. His study is an inter-

pretation, which in turn becomes a prophecy. A clear analysis is made of the Roman, Greek, and Hebrew contributions to civilization; and the physical, intellectual, and spiritual elements of the threefold development merge in the spirit and form of our Anglo-Saxon institutions. On this groundwork the serious duty of the present outlines itself. Opportunity is obligation; and the grandeur of our American opportunity measures the obligation of the American Church and State. Christ, according to the author, explains the enigma of human progress and solves the problems of society as clearly as he does those of personal character. A just conception of Christianity is the germ of the author's philosophy, and in consequence all its conclusions are definite and reasonable. Atheistic and irreligious study touches the circumference alone, while devout and spiritual investigation reaches the center; and for this reason *The New Era* is full of central truths. The fatal distinction between the sacred and the secular, expressing itself in the divorce of doctrine from conduct, is deplored. The increasing alienation of the masses from the Church and the causes of this separation are forcibly sketched, and at the same time the possibility of a complete reconciliation is earnestly maintained. The Church must recognize in the intense activity of the times the need of new methods on its own part, and must adapt its approaches to the conscience of the community and of the individual to the form of present exigency and temptation. It must be wise, eager, economical of resources, and always quick to take occasion by the hand. The chapters on "Popular Discontent" and "An Enthusiasm for Humanity" are perhaps the best. The last is especially eloquent and impressive, marking, as it does, the convergence of the lines of reasoning traced in the preceding pages. Such books as *The New Era* belong to this generation, endowed as it is with solemn and imperative responsibilities. Men must think, and times like these furnish the incentive to thought. This volume is a profound meditation upon those grave and urgent questions of personal and public duty and danger which we cannot avoid. Criticism might busy itself in minute matters, such as the relevancy of some parts of the discussion to its main treatment, the abundant use of quotations, etc.; but these, if they occur, are only incidental, and do not in any way lessen the essential value of *The New Era*, which will attract and hold popular attention and win a notable place in the permanent literature of the day.

Masses and Classes. A Study of Industrial Conditions in England. By HENRY TUCKLEY, Author of *Under the Queen*, etc. 12mo, pp. 179. Cincinnati: Cranstoun & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

This book is opportune. The study of industrial conditions falls alike within the domain of present-day philanthropy and economics, and may be investigated from either standpoint. As long as the working classes are so poorly remunerated as to prevent their acquirement of many ordinary comforts they will elicit Christian sympathy; and as long as the ratio of wages to the profit of the employer continues so disproportionate the adjustment of the inequality will continue one of the burning questions of

political economy. Mr. Tuckley in his volume now under notice seems to speak both as a Christian philanthropist and as a student of economics. His work is along a somewhat unusual line. Avoiding the discussion of abstract principles of reform—of whose overconsideration there is possible danger—he narrates his personal interviews with the representatives of different classes of English workingmen and gives the results of his inquiries as to wages and living. That the breadwinners of England are far worse situated than those in the United States is strikingly borne out by some of his citations. When we read such statements as that a capable English clerk earns from \$500 to \$750 yearly; that the average pay for factory girls is \$2.50 per week; that the wages of farm laborers are under, rather than above, \$3 weekly; and that many “carpenters, bricklayers, masons, plasterers, and other skilled workmen” fall far below \$10 per week, we are keenly impressed that in Great Britain, far more than in America, has the workman cause for grievance. The current saying that “England is the paradise of workingmen” is, in other words, a pleasant sentiment rather than the substantial fact. In respect to comforts the United States is far in the lead. Yet, so far as the American breadwinner has reason for unrest, the present compilation is not without its lessons. The workingman is entitled, if not to more than, yet to all his due. “These English breadwinners are in the vanguard of a battle which must be fought out finally in every nation under the sun, and which, so far as the United States is concerned, has already commenced. This battle is the stern contest of the masses . . . for a larger, fairer share in the products of their own toil, the battle for fair wages and a fair chance to enjoy life.” To a proper understanding of the merits of such a conflict all books like Mr. Tuckley’s are an important contribution.

Other Essays from the Easy Chair. By GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS. 16mo, pp. 229. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1.

For some thirty-five years the genial author of the above essays occupied the “Easy Chair” in *Harper’s Magazine*. During that time he produced not far from fifteen hundred essays; and many were the confirmed readers of the magazine who were addicted to the habit of turning first of all to this department. Of these essays several of the more noteworthy were reproduced in a previous volume in uniform style published since his death, entitled *From the Easy Chair*. The present volume contains about thirty additional specimens from the same rich mine. They cover a great variety of subjects, ranging from a “National Nominating Convention” and “Twed” to “The New Year,” “The Golden Age,” and “Spring Pictures,” and including articles on “Bryant’s Country,” Emerson, Beecher, and General Sherman. These little articles may, without exaggeration, be characterized as gems of pure and at the same time fascinating English prose. The students who, in order to acquire a style at once combining elegance, simplicity, and beauty, would have been recommended in a previous generation to spend their days and nights in the study of Addison could hardly in these latter times be referred to a

more perfect model than these kindly essays of Mr. Curtis. But more than this, they are the expression of a cultured, noble, and pure-minded soul, a lover of all that is beautiful and true and good; and they abound in keen insight and homely wisdom as well as the most exquisite medley of eloquence and pathos and humor. In an address delivered before the Brooklyn Society of Arts and Sciences Mr. John White Chadwick said of these essays: "And what was the central theme? It was a plea for good society; for the best society; which is not a matter of wealth, nor of somebody's descent from somebody who was somebody or had something in some former generation; but a matter of intelligence and simplicity and kindliness, freedom from vulgar show, the love of things that make for honor, purity, and nobility in the most ordinary lives." Those who read this dainty volume will enjoy a feast of substantial worth and of delicate and genuine literary flavor.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

The Life of Catherine Booth, the Mother of the Salvation Army. In Two Volumes. By F. DE L. BOOTH-TUCKER. 8vo. Vol. i, pp. 663; vol. ii, pp. 692. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$3.50.

Out of Old England, which gave the Wesleys and the Wesleyan reformation to the world, has come a later evangelistic movement whose blessing is already upon all the nations. To study any such reform in Church or State is to discover the perpetual law of the divine workings that all moral renewals center around the personality of individuals. Were the above volumes merely the life story of a saintly woman who, as the wife of a useful minister of the Methodist New Connexion, had been the instrument of great good in parish work and had finished her course in Christian triumph, they would still merit a place in church biography. But the knowledge that she was the chosen agent, in company with her illustrious husband, for the ushering in of a reform which, at least as to consecration and zeal, is not surpassed since the days of St. Paul surrounds this biography with surpassing interest. It is scarcely possible for the student of modern ecclesiastical history, as he reads the story, to overlook the various parallels between the Salvation Army movement and early Methodism. Both had their visible origin in the hearts of consecrated workers. Each was the outgrowth of the moral laxity of the times; each made its first appeal to the degraded classes of England; and if the earlier Methodism marched without the drum and cornet its spirit has, nevertheless, been essentially military to the present day. But if the Salvation Army appears in some sense a reproduction of the Wesleyan reformation as to spirit, discipline, doctrine, the utilization of the press, and other features, the personal qualities of Susannah Wesley seem also duplicated in her who is now affectionately called "the Mother of the Salvation Army." She was not born for subordinate work, but, in the good providence of God, she was led out into that large place of organization and

leadership for which her biography shows her to have been fitted. In heart qualities, in intellectual vigor, in rare consecration to holy things, in the rearing up of her children to usefulness and prominence in the Lord's work, in her understanding of human nature, Catherine Booth is worthy of all comparison with Susannah Wesley; and, like the mother of the eighteenth century reformer, her influence will be as enduring as time. We would gladly linger over all the features of this biography were it possible; but it is necessarily so voluminous as to render this inexpedient. The reader is well-nigh bewildered by the vast array of facts presented and by the many ramifications in the life history of Mrs. Booth. The place and the power of woman's work in evangelization, the marvelous growth of the Salvation Army in many lands, the agency of religion in sociological reform, and the need of holiness in the Church are taught or suggested by this biography. We can only mention it in praise. It is not prolix and wearisome; it is not constructed with over-partiality, though written by one of Mrs. Booth's kindred. It is intelligent, broad, inclusive, and is not surpassed in subject-matter or execution by any religious biography of the times.

An American Missionary in Japan. By Rev. M. L. GORDON, M.D. 16mo, pp. 276. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

The Ainu of Japan. The Religion, Superstitions, and General History of the Hairy Aborigines of Japan. With Eighty Illustrations. By the Rev. JOHN BATCHELOR, C. M. S. Missionary to the Ainu, Compiler of *An Ainu-English-Japanese Dictionary*, etc. Crown 8vo, pp. 336. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The Story of Uganda and the Victoria Nyanza Mission. With Fifteen Illustrations. By SARAH GERALDINA STOCK. 12mo, pp. 223. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

James Gilmour of Mongolia. His Diaries, Letters, and Reports. With Three Portraits, Two Maps, and Four Illustrations. Edited and Arranged by RICHARD LOVETT, M.A. Crown 8vo, pp. 336. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

The literature of missions was never more valuable than in these latter days of missionary advance. Necessary instruction is thereby furnished to the home Church, through which its zeal is quickened and its contributions enlarged; and none the less are candidates for mission fields inspired for their heroic and exalted work. We should, therefore, gratefully recognize the purpose of such books as the above, which present the topography of heathen countries, the racial characteristics of the Eastern nations, philological difficulties to be encountered, the customs of heathen worship, or the narrative of missionary successes in foreign fields.

The first two books, which we now group together, belonging to this instructive class, have reference to the progress of Christian work in Japan. It is twenty years since Dr. Gordon went as a missionary to this field; and as an experienced worker among the Japanese and later the Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in the Dōshisha University, his descriptions have the merit of accuracy as well as vividness. Grouping in a miscellaneous way the story of Japanese customs, traits,

and vigor, he has given a new interest to missionary work in that distant land. And the Gospel is there mightily progressing. For, primarily, he has aimed, as he asserts, to record what he has seen "of the wonderful manner in which the religion of Christ is approaching the minds and hearts and lives of the Japanese people, and their noble response to this divine and gracious approach." The Ainu, to whom among others the good news of salvation has been carried, are "the aborigines of Japan." Superstitions, polytheistic, and decadent as they are, Mr. Batchelor, in his volume, has drawn their picture with a graphic pen.

The story of Uganda, as told by Sarah Geraldina Stock, is a record of sun and shadow, of safety and danger, of life and death, for the missionary workers of Eastern Africa. The martyrdom of Bishop Hannington, the untimely death of Bishop Parker and Mackay, and the massacre of native converts in 1886, are among the tragedies that crowd the volume. Yet, however variant the success of missionary work in Uganda up to the present time, one cannot but feel that ultimate triumph is there insured for Christianity under the lead of such self-denying, consecrated, death-defying missionaries as are herein described. Through such is the kingdom of heaven taken by force.

Among the noble souls that have gone heavenward from the midst of missionary toil must be written the name of James Gilmour. Of Scottish birth, and educated at Glasgow University, he went to China in 1870, and was privileged to spend twenty-one years in labor among the Mongolians. For his piety, his quaintness of character, his sweet domestic associations, and his marked success in a difficult field his memoir is full of charm. One closes the book with a new sense of kinship to those who are toiling in the far places to make God's kingdom come; and with a prayer that, under the inspiration of such literature, new apostles may go forth to answer the Macedonian voices which fill the world.

A Short History of the English People. By J. R. GREEN, M.A. Illustrated Edition. Edited by Mrs. J. R. GREEN and Miss KATE NORGATE. 8vo, pp. 931 (two volumes). New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$5 per volume.

In the enumeration of the master historians of the century the name of John Richard Green will not be omitted. The examination of the present beautiful volumes, which are a part of a series, no less impresses the reader with the majesty of the national history that is depicted, or the perfection of the illustrator's art, than with the essential greatness of the man himself who conceived the method of the *Short History* and put the work into finished phrase. Mr. Green was no ordinary man. Antecedent to any discussion of the scope or the merits of his history we must be grateful to the editor for her biographical sketch of the historian as contained in her "Introduction." In this portrayal he stands out before us with statuesque clearness and strength. From the age of sixteen, when Gibbon awoke within him the "enthusiasm for history," we follow with interest the gradual unfolding of his historic scheme; in his struggle with disease and his forced night writing for support our sympathy is stirred;

in the display of his manly qualities we yield to the fascination of his character; in his premature death we deplore the departure of a noble spirit. Great as is his work, from various standpoints, the man himself is greater than his best workmanship. As to his *Short History* itself, it has stood the test of criticism for nearly a score of years since its first issue, and is its own advocate and interpreter. In its fundamental conception the aim, as is well known, is to portray the history of the common people of England in contradistinction from her kings or her conquests. In its scope it sweeps the historic field from A. D. 449 to the present era. As to its structure it is a poem in prose, and on both sides of the Atlantic it has won a prominent place among historical authorities. "Read by hundreds of thousands of Englishmen," says Mrs. Green, "it has not passed through their hands without communicating something of that passion of patriotism by which it is itself inspired, as it creates and illuminates for the English democracy that vision of the continuous life of a mighty people, and as it quickens faith in that noble ideal of freedom which we have brought as our great contribution to the sum of human effort. Among English-speaking people beyond the seas, where it has yet a greater number of readers than here, it has helped to strengthen the sense of kinship and the reverence for our common past." With such an influence exerted by this newer history on both sides of the Atlantic its present issue in illustrated form is natural, wholesome, and cordially welcome. History is always capable of pictorial representation, and of all national growths the story of the English development, with its many thrilling passages, lends itself particularly to the engraver's art. For the earlier centuries Danish and Swedish collections have been drawn upon in the representation of household implements, armor, ornaments, and the like. For the period extending from the eighth to the sixteenth century resort has been had to the illuminated manuscripts in the British Museum, in the Public Record Office, at Lambeth, and in the Bodleian and various other college libraries. For the later centuries manuscripts, prints, engravings, and various other authorities have been consulted. The result of all this is two volumes, as far as the series has as yet gone, which in workmanship and pictorial charm are beyond easy description. An intrinsically great history, in other words, becomes more valuable under the engraver's skill.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Woman and the Higher Education. Edited by ANNA C. BRACKETT. *The Literature of Philanthropy.* Edited by FRANCES A. GOODALE. *Early Prose and Verse.* Edited by ALICE MORSE EARL and EMILY ELLSWORTH FORD. *The Kindergarten.* Edited by KATE DOUGLAS WIGGIN. *Household Art.* Edited by CANDACE WHEELER. *Short Stories.* Edited by CONSTANCE CARY HARRISON. The Instaff Series. 6 vols., 16mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, ornamental, \$1 each.

These volumes are part of the "Exhibit of Woman's Work in Literature in the State of New York," to be preserved in the State Library in

the capital at Albany. Inside and outside they are women's work. The contents are from women's brains; the cover was designed and the types were set by women. We can give particular notice to only one. The volume open before us is *The Literature of Philanthropy*. It contains essays on "Criminal Reform," "The Tenement Neighborhood Idea," "University Settlements," "Medical Women in Tenements," "The Trained Nurse," "The Society of the Red Cross," "The Indian," "A Woman Among the Indians," "The Antislavery Struggle," "The Antislavery Legacy," "The Negro and Civilization," "The Education of the Blind." Our spiritual sensibility feels the trickle of warm tears and the light of a sweet smile across these pages. There is the throb of a soft pulse-beat through the lines, and reading is like laying one's finger on the wrist of a hand that once was pierced of Him who was dead but is alive again for evermore. We mean that a humane compassion, born in flesh and blood by the Spirit of the divine Christ, is seen at work in all the philanthropies and succors which this small book records. Finishing this volume, written by women concerning women's merciful work, we feel as if we had been to the Holy Land and some woman of Tiberias had shown us footprints on the beach of the Sea of Galilee actually made by the feet which once a woman bathed with her tears and wiped with her hair; for the soil where such divine philanthropies transpire is sanctified thereby, and such deeds as these among frontier wigwams, tenements of city slums, cabins of freedmen, hospital wards and beds of suffering, prison cells and scenes of appalling disaster, and devastation by flood, fire, earthquake, or famine—such deeds do signify and certify that Jesus Christ has passed along that way in the persons of those in whom, whether they realize it fully or faintly, he by his Spirit effectually and dominantly dwells.

Work and Workers. Practical Suggestions for the Junior Epworth League. By FREDERICK S. PARKHURST, B.D. With an Introduction by Rev. EDWIN A. SCHELL, D.D., General Secretary of the Epworth League. 12mo, pp. 85. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. Price, cloth, 40 cents.

The Latter-Day Eden, Treating of Wedlock and the Home. By HENRY TUCKLEY, Author of *Under the Queen*, etc. 12mo, pp. 251. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

The Primary Teacher. With Helps and Exercises. By MARTHA VAN METER. Introduction by JESSE LYMAN HURLBUT, D.D. 12mo, pp. 166. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. Price, cloth, 70 cents.

The Master Sower. By Rev. F. T. DAVIS, A.M. 12mo, pp. 196. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

Seven Graded Sunday Schools. A Series of Practical Papers. Edited by JESSE LYMAN HURLBUT, Secretary of the Sunday School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 16mo, pp. 120. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

The Pathway of Victory. By Hon. ROBERT E. GIRDLESTONE, M.A., Canon of Christ Church, etc. 12mo, pp. 85. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 30 cents.

The titles of the above volumes generally suggest their aim and method of treatment. We would fain speak of each in full detail were

we not circumscribed by the limits of our columns. There is not a careless or unworthy book in the group. On each the comment may be passed that it is earnest, concise, and instructive.

The Revival Quiver. A Pastor's Record of Four Revival Campaigns. By Rev. LOUIS ALBERT BANKS, D.D., Author of *The People's Christ*, etc. 12mo, pp. 234. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The whole trend of this volume is toward the necessity and value of revivals. An earnest pastor, who has been unusually blessed in evangelistic labors, here reveals, so far as such methods are a matter of description, some of the secrets of his revivalistic practice. The outlines of many hortatory addresses, which have been the means of "the conversion of several hundreds of men and women," also accompany the story of his methods of work. It is a good book, and should inspire other Christian ministers to help make the world better.

At the Beautiful Gate, and Other Songs of Faith. By LUCY LARCOM. 16mo, pp. 177. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

One of the merits of the verses of Lucy Larcom is their religious quality. In addition to a right regard for meter and versification, as well as all other mechanical considerations involved in poetic work, her sentiment is that which breathes of Christian faith and tranquillity. Particularly in the present collection of sonnets does this feature obtain. Whoever is hungry for the consolation which is available in poetry for the burdened and troubled heart will be cheered by these songs of resignation and hope. The late poetess has left to the world a rich legacy.

Only Judith. By LYDIA L. ROUSE. 12mo, pp. 231. Price, cloth, 85 cents.

Sybil's Repentance, or a Dream of Good. By Mrs. M. S. HAYCRAFT. 12mo, pp. 152. Price, cloth, 70 cents.

Amos Truelove. A Story of the Last Generation. By CHARLES R. PARSONS, Author of *The Man with the White Hat*. 12mo, pp. 240. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Lady Marjorie. A Countess of New England. By EMMA LESLIE. 12mo, pp. 217. Price, cloth, 80 cents.

Jacob Winterton's Inheritance. By EMILIE SEARCHFIELD. 12mo, pp. 159. Price, cloth, 70 cents.

Life's Battle Won. By JULIA A. W. DE WITT, Author of *How He Made His Fortune*, etc. 12mo, pp. 312. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Personal Reminiscences of the War. By Rev. J. D. BLOODGOOD, late Sergeant Company I, 141st Pennsylvania Volunteers. 12mo, pp. 342. Price, cloth, \$1.

Forging the Sword, or the Holy War. 12mo, pp. 207. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

Cameron Slope. A Story of Mining Life. By Rev. R. F. BISHOP, of the Ohio Conference. 12mo, pp. 320. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

The Cracked Hearthstone. By JOHN M. BAMFORD. 12mo, pp. 180. Price, cloth, 70 cents.

Newer publications for Sunday school libraries. Published by the Eastern and Western Book Concerns. Bright, inexpensive, safe.

INDEX.

- Aesthetic in Religion: *Wright*, 90.
Ames: Hamlet, from the Standpoint of Theology, 369.
Anthony: Eternal Verities, 97.
 Arnold, Matthew: *Hyde*, 867.
Baker: Amos Shinkle, 177.
 Balaam and his Day: *Hyde*, 206.
 Barnabas and Saul, Call and Ordination of: *Sutherland*, 562.
Bolton: After the Revival (Symposium), 234.
Bowne: Evolution and Evolution, 681.
Botene: Some Popular Mistakes respecting Evolution, 849.
Brodbeck: Prosecution of the Revival (Symposium), 247.
 Call and Ordination of Barnabas and Saul, etc.: *Sutherland*, 562.
 Charles the Great—His Relation to the Church: *Hurst*, 345.
 Children, Moral and Spiritual Status of Infant (Arena), 471.
 Children, Relation of Young to the Church (Arena), 699.
 Christian Ethics, Application to Social Life (Cur. Dis.), 456.
 Christianity, Comparative View of Ethnic Religions and: *Stuart*, 35.
 Christianity Progressing, etc. (Cur. Dis.), 785.
 Christianity, Some Aspects of Early: *Super*, 896.
 Church, Functions of (Cur. Dis.), 623.
 Church History, Suppressed Chapter of Recent: *Faulkner*, 513.
 Church Union, etc. (Cur. Dis.), 615.
 City Missions and Social Problems: *North*, 228.
 Clay and Adams, Old Political Scandal: *Hoss*, 598.
 College, Problem of the (Cur. Dis.), 626.
 Coming Hero, The: *Johnson*, 915.
 Commonwealths, Ideal: *Wheatley*, 581.
 Deaconesses, A Field for (Arena), 134.
 Desire of All Nations: *Terry*, 293.
 Disparagement, An Unnecessary (Arena), 304.
 Diversity of Language and National Unity: *Wilker*, 576.
 Doctrinal Standards, Value of (Cur. Dis.), 117.
 Dogma and Life, etc. (Cur. Dis.), 278.
 Down With the Old, etc.: *Pearne*, 747.
 Dr. Strong's Positions Maintained (Arena), 965.
 Dr. Strong's Self-Correction (Arena), 475.
 Dr. Strong's Self-Correction, Correction of (Arena), 642.
 Editorial Announcement (Cur. Dis.), 278.
 Editorial Salutory (Cur. Dis.), 449.
 Educational Statistics, Some Recent: *Norton*, 57.
 Eternal Verities: *Anthony*, 97.
 Ethics, Application of Christian, to Social Life (Cur. Dis.), 456.
 Ethnic Religions and Christianity, Comparative View of: *Stuart*, 35.
 Evangelical Association of North America, Dissensions in (Cur. Dis.), 913.
 Evolution and Evolution: *Bowne*, 681.
 Evolution, Some Popular Mistakes respecting: *Bowne*, 849.
Faulkner: Suppressed Chapter of Recent Church History, 513.
 Foreign Parts, Society for Propagation of Gospel in, etc. (Arena), 807.
 Foreign Résumé, 141, 313, 481, 648, 817, 975.
Fradenburgh: Order of Melchizedek, 426.
 Free Will, Definition of (Arena), 133, 473.
 God's Hand in Our Nation's History (Cur. Dis.), 459.
Goodsell: Whither? A Study of Tendency, 9.
 Gospel According to Nature (Arena), 474.
 Gospel in Nature: *Moore*, 23.
 Hamlet, from Standpoint of Theology: *Ames*, 369.
Hammell: Novatis, 721.
 Heathen, What Light Have the? (Arena), 967.
 Hero, The Coming: *Johnson*, 915.
 Hezekiah, Sargon, and Sennacherib: *Horner*, 74.
Hines: Our Early Missionary Work in Oregon, 413.
 History, God's Hand in Our Nation's (Cur. Dis.), 459.
 Holy Ghost and Human Temperament (Arena), 811.
Horner: Hezekiah, Sargon, and Sennacherib, 74.
Hoss: An Old Political Scandal, etc., 598.
Howard: Semicentennial of the Scotch Free Church, 438.
Hurst: Charles the Great—His Relation to the Church, 345.
Hyde: Balaam and his Day, 206.
Hyde: Matthew Arnold, 867.
 Ideal Commonwealths: *Wheatley*, 581.
Iglehart: John Greenleaf Whittier, 43.
 India, Theological Schools for Pastor-Teachers in (Arena), 132.
 Infant Children, Moral and Spiritual Status of (Arena), 471.
 Is Christianity Progressing? etc. (Cur. Dis.), 785.
 Itinerants' Club, 136, 308, 476, 643, 812, 969.
 Jewish Gathering in New York, Significance of (Cur. Dis.), 290.
Johnson: The Coming Hero, 915.
 Judgment, Right of Private (Cur. Dis.), 284.
Kemble: True Gospel According to Peter, 357.
Knorr: Turanian Blood in Anglo-Saxon Race, 657.
Kuyper: Pantheism's Destruction of Boundaries, 520, 762.
 Language, Diversity of, and National Unity. *Wilker*, 576.

- Marriage, Roman Catholic Doctrine and Law of: *Starbuck*, 878.
- McElfresh*: The Theology of Milton, 69.
- Mead*: Pauline Epistles Classified according to External Evidence, 735, 924.
- Melchizedek, Order of: *Fradenburgh*, 426.
- Methodism (Arena), 135.
- Methodism as Affected by Recent Biblical Criticism (Arena), 964.
- Methodist Journalistic Enterprise, A Hint to (Arena), 966.
- Millennium, The (Arena), 642.
- Milton, The Theology of: *McElfresh*, 69.
- Ministerial Individuality (Arena), 131.
- Miracles, Can Natural Science Account for? (Arena), 810.
- Mission Work in Oregon, Early: *Hines*, 413.
- Missionary Impulse, Modern (Cur. Dis.), 109.
- Moore*: Gospel in Nature, 23.
- Mudge*: Prayer, 707.
- Nation's History, God's Hand in Our (Cur. Dis.), 459.
- Natural Science, Can [it] Account for Miracles? (Arena), 810.
- Nature, Gospel According to (Arena), 474.
- Nature, Gospel in: *Moore*, 23.
- Necly*: "The Sunday Service," 215.
- North: City Missions and Social Problems, 228.
- Norton*: Some Recent Educational Statistics, 57.
- Novalis: *Hammell*, 721.
- Old Political Scandal, etc.: *Hoss*, 598.
- Opinion, 104, 273, 444, 610, 779, 938.
- Order for Public Worship (Arena), 638.
- Oregon, Our Early Missionary Work in: *Hines*, 413.
- Our Largest School of Theology: *Vincent*, 190.
- Pantheism's Destruction of Boundaries: *Kuyper*, 520, 762.
- Passions, Sanctification of: *Rishell*, 380.
- Pauline Epistles Classified according to External Evidence: *Mead*, 735, 924.
- Pearne*: Down with the Old, etc., 747.
- Peck*: The Preparation for the Revival (Symposium), 240.
- Peter, True Gospel According to: *Kemble*, 357.
- Prayer: *Mudge*, 707.
- Prescience of Future Contingencies (Arena), 968.
- Private Judgment, Right of: (Cur. Dis.), 234.
- Progress of Civilization, 127, 209, 467, 634, 803, 961.
- Propagation of Gospel, Society, etc. (Arena), 807.
- Public Worship, Order for (Arena), 638.
- Railroad and Other Affairs, Truth and Falsehood in (Cur. Dis.), 954.
- Resurrection, St. Paul's Ideas of (Arena), 306.
- Reviews and Magazines: African Methodist Episcopal Church Review, 328, 826, 827; American Catholic Quarterly, 155, 600; Andover, 492, 831, 983, 986; Baptist Quarterly, 323; Biblical World, 656, 832, 988; Bibliotheca Sacra, 150, 222, 656; Canadian Methodist Quarterly, 324, 831; Catholic World, 495, 662; Chautauquan, 830, 832, 988; Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal, 496; Christian Thought, 151, 325; Contemporary, 143, 155, 327, 493, 657, 661, 988; Converted Catholic, 156; Critical Review, 156, 832; Edinburgh, 154, 494; English Illustrated Magazine, 156, 328; Fortnightly, 154, 321, 659, 832, 986; Globe, 152; Gospel in All Lands, 156, 328, 496; Harper's New Monthly, 155; Hartford Seminary Record, 325; Homiletic Review, 156, 328, 489, 494, 988; Indian Evangelical Review, 496, 661; Lippincott's, 328; London Quarterly, 153, 662; Lutheran Quarterly, 149, 152, 326, 826, 827; Methodist Magazine, 156, 326, 988; Missionary Review of the World, 156, 323, 493, 663, 832, 987; New England Historical and Genealogical Register, 328, 829; New Jerusalem Magazine, 827, 987; New World, 321, 323, 490, 659, 985; Nineteenth Century, 155, 491, 657, 829, 988; North American, 149, 151, 326, 490, 658, 826, 828, 983, 986; Our Day, 495, 663, 987; Preachers' Magazine, 663, 829, 832; Presbyterian and Reformed, 496, 826 (2); Presbyterian Quarterly, 143, 829, 983; Presbyterian Quarterly, Southern, 150, 325; Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 153, 324, 829; Quarterly Review of United Brethren in Christ, 153, 659, 827; Review of Reviews, 663, 838; Treasury of Religious Thought, 156, 328, 663, 828, 988; Wesleyan Magazine, 323; Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, 156, 328, 496, 830, 987; Westminster Review, 327; Worthington's Illustrated Magazine, 988; Yale Review, 492, 661, 983, 984.
- Revival, a Symposium: *Peck, Brodbeck, Bolton*, 240.
- Rishell*: Sanctification of the Passions, 380.
- Roman Catholic Doctrine and Law of Marriage: *Starbuck*, 878.
- Salutatory, Editorial (Cur. Dis.), 449.
- Sanctification of the Passions: *Rishell*, 380.
- School of Theology, Our Largest: *Vincent*, 190.
- Scotch Free Church, Semicentennial of the: *Howard*, 438.
- Shelley's Revolutionary Ideal, etc.: *Smyscr*, 533.
- Shinkle, Amos: *Baker*, 177.
- Smyscr*: Shelley's Revolutionary Ideal, etc., 533.
- Social Problem: *Wheeler*, 554.
- Socialism and Christianity (Arena), 303.
- Society for Propagation of Gospel in Foreign Parts (Arena), 807.
- Songs of the Church: *Strong*, 258.
- Starbuck*: Roman Catholic Doctrine and Law of Marriage, 878.
- St. Paul's Ideas of the Resurrection (Arena), 306.
- Strong*: Songs of the Church, 258.
- Stuart*: Comparative View of Ethnic Religions and Christianity, 35.
- Style, Some Conditions of: *Wheeler*, 910.
- "Sunday Service": *Necly*, 215.
- Super*: Some Aspects of Early Christianity, 836.
- Suppressed Chapter of Recent Church History: *Faulkner*, 513.
- Sutherland*: Call and Ordination of Barnabas and Saul, etc., 562.
- Symposium, The Revival: *Peck, Brodbeck, Bolton*, 240.
- Terry*: Desire of All Nations, 268.
- Theological Schools for Pastor-Teachers in India (Arena), 132.
- Theology of Milton: *McElfresh*, 69.
- Theology, Our Largest School of: *Vincent*, 190.
- Times of Refreshing (Cur. Dis.), 122.
- Todd*: Wheels, Work, and Wages, 393.

True Gospel According to Peter: *Kemble*, 357.
 Truth and Falsehood in Railroad and Other Affairs (Cur. Dis.), 954.
 Turanian Blood in Anglo-Saxon Race: *Knor*, 697.
 Union, Church, etc. (Cur. Dis.), 615.
 Unnecessary Disparagement, An (Arena), 304.
 Versions versus Vernaculars (Cur. Dis.), 795.
 Vincent: Our Largest School of Theology, 190.
 Wages and Profits (Arena), 640.
 Wheatley: Ideal Commonwealths, 581.
 Wheeler: Some Conditions of Style, 910.
 Wheeler: The Social Problem, 554.
 Wheels, Work, and Wages: *To-day*, 393.
 Whither? A Study of Tendency: *Goodsell*, 9.
 Whittier, John Greenleaf: *Iglehart*, 43.
 Wilker: Diversity of Language and National Unity, 576.
 Worship, Order for Public (Arena), 638.
 Wright: The Aesthetic in Religion, 90.

BOOK NOTICES.

Acts of the Apostles: *Stokes*, 666.
 Adams: Three Episodes of Massachusetts History, 169.
 Adeney: Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, 666.
 Aldrich: Children, Models and Critics, 176.
 Alert Stories, etc., 344.
 A. L. O. E.: The Young Pilgrim, 680.
 Along New England Roads: *Prime*, 512.
 American Missionary in Japan: *Gordon*, 998.
 Amos, etc.: *Mitchell*, 332.
 Amos Truelove: *Parsons*, 1002.
 Apologetics, etc.: *Bruce*, 157.
 Appleton: Greek Poets in English Verse, 505.
 Armies of To-day, 165.
 At the Beautiful Gate, etc.: *Larcom*, 1002.
 Aurora Leigh, and Other Poems: *Browning*, 167.
 Baldwin: Must the Chinese Go? etc., 680.
 Bamford: Miss Millie's Trying, 344.
 Bamford: The Cracked Hearthstone, 1002.
 Banks: Our Brother in Yellow, 679.
 Banks: The Revival Quiver, 1002.
 Barnes: Canonical and Uncanonical Gospels, 667.
 Batchelor: The Atmu of Japan, 998.
 Beauty, Desire of: *Child*, 176.
 Beet: Through Christ to God, 331.
 Berean Beginner's Lesson Book, 176.
 Berean Intermediate Lesson Book, 176.
 Berean Senior Lesson Book, 176.
 Bible in World's Education: *Warren*, 497.
 Bible, Its Origin, etc.: *Sunderland*, 991.
 Bible Lessons for Little Children, Simple: *Loring*, 342.
 Bigelow: Fellowship of Hearts, 511.
 Bishop: Cameron Slope, etc., 1002.
 Bishop's Conversion: *Marwell*, 171.
 Bissell: Genesis Printed in Colors, 161.
 Blackie: The Book of Joshua, 666.
 Blasts from a Ram's Horn: *Brown*, 176.
 Bloodgood: Personal Reminiscences of the War, 1002.
 Bonsal: Morocco As It Is, 510.
 Bonnell: On Wheels, etc., 174.
 Books and Their Use: *Thayer*, 698.
 Booth, Life of Catherine, etc.: *Booth-Tucker*, 997.
 Booth-Tucker: Life of Catherine Booth, etc., 997.

Brackets: Woman and Higher Education, 1000.
 Bridge: Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne, 675.
 Bright Nook: *Gayford*, 680.
 Brother in Yellow, Our: *Banks*, 679.
 Brown: Blasts from a Ram's Horn, 176.
 Browning: Aurora Leigh, and Other Poems, 167.
 Browning, Selections from Robert, 167.
 Bruce: Apologetics, etc., 157.
 Buckley: Faith Healing, etc., 166.
 Buffalo, Methodism in: *Hunt*, 677.
 Bunny Stories: *Jewett*, 176.
 Buoy: Representative Women of Methodism, 338.
 Call of the Cross: *Herron*, 343.
 Cameron Slope, etc.: *Bishop*, 1002.
 Campbell: Puritan in Holland, England, and America, 845.
 Canonical and Uncanonical Gospels: *Barnes*, 667.
 Chicago and World's Fair, Harper's: *Ralph*, 340.
 Child: Desire of Beauty, 176.
 Child: The Praise of Paris, 341.
 Children, Models and Critics: *Aldrich*, 176.
 Chinese, Must the, Go? etc.: *Baldwin*, 680.
 Christ and Inheritance of Saints: *Guthrie*, 165.
 Christ Enthroned in Industrial World: *Roads*, 503.
 Christianity, Democracy of: *White*, 164.
 Christianity, Evolution of: *Savage*, 162.
 Christlieb, Theodor: *Kingsbury and Garbutt*, 509.
 Christmas Every Day, etc.: *Howells*, 175.
 Christmas Times in Crocus Family: *Ranger*, 680.
 Christus Consolator, etc.: *Haven*, 669.
 Church, Short History of Christian: *Hurst*, 676.
 Churchill: Pulpit Bible Reading, 512.
 Clark: Religion for the Times, 836.
 Clark: The Picturesque Ohio, 512.
 Coffin: Abraham Lincoln, 339.
 Collingwood: Life and Work of John Ruskin, 543.
 Cracked Hearthstone: *Bamford*, 1002.
 Cross, Call of the: *Herron*, 343.
 Cry from the Depths: *Curnick*, 847.
 Curnick: Cry from the Depths, 847.
 Currie: Tiff with the Tiffls, 344.
 Curtis: Other Essays from the Easy Chair, 996.
 Daily Press, London: *Massingham*, 680.
 Daisy Downs: *Robbins*, 818.
 Daniel: A Ramble Among Surnames, 674.
 Danube, etc.: *Millet*, 338.
 Davis: Elements of Deductive Logic, 336.
 Davis: The Master Sower, 1001.
 Dawson: Quest and Vision, 174.
 Deductive Logic, Elements of: *Davis*, 336.
 Democracy of Christianity: *White*, 164.
 Desire of Beauty: *Child*, 176.
 De Witt: Life's Battle Won, 1002.
 Did a Hen or an Egg Exist First? etc.: *Horn*, 166.
 Divine Balustrades, etc.: *MacArthur*, 343.
 Dockings: Pulpit Bible Reading, 512.
 Dods: Gospel of John, 159.
 Doherty: Illustrative Notes, 161, 994.
 Duchess of Berry, etc.: *Salut-A-mand*, 173.
 Earl: Early Prose and Verse, 1000.
 Early Prose and Verse: *Earl and Ford*, 1000.
 Egypt, Ten Years' Hiding in: *Petrie*, 340.
 Emerson: Pulpit Bible Reading, 512.

- English People, Short History of: *Green*, 999.
 Ephesians, Epistle to: *Findlay*, 159.
 Etter: Thorn in the Flesh, 162.
 Everett: Gospel of Paul, 499.
 Evolution of Christianity: *Savage*, 162.
 Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther: *Adeney*, 666.
 Fairy Tales, Maud Humphrey's Book of, 344.
 Faith Healing, etc.: *Buckley*, 166.
 Farrar: First Book of Kings, 666.
 Fellowship of Hearts: *Bigelow*, 511.
 Ferguson: Practical Hints on Junior League Work, 174.
 Field Farings: *Williams*, 344.
 Findlay: Epistle to Ephesians, 159.
 Fisher: Manual of Natural Theology, 501.
 Ford: Early Prose and Verse, 1000.
 Forging the Sword, etc., 1002.
 Four Centuries of Silence: *Redford*, 333.
 France Under the Regency: *Perkins*, 506.
 Frederick the Great, Youth of: *Lavisse*, 173.
 Froebel Letters: *Heinemann*, 846.
 Garratt: Theodor Christlieb, 599.
 Gaylord: Bright Nook, 689.
 Genesis Printed in Colors: *Bissell*, 161.
 George: A Perplexed Philosopher, etc., 335.
 Gibson: Sharp Eyes, 175.
 Gifford: Laws of the Soul, 840.
 Gilman: Socialism and the American Spirit, 673.
 Gilmour, James, of Mongolia: *Lovett*, 998.
 Girdlestone: The Pathway of Victory, 1001.
 Gladden: Tools and the Man, 672.
 Gloria Patri, etc.: *Whitton*, 500.
 God, Guide to Knowledge of: *Gratry*, 835.
 Golden City: *Tudor*, 848.
 Goodale: Literature of Philanthropy, 1000.
 Gordon: American Missionary in Japan, 998.
 Gordon: Holy Spirit in Missions, 661.
 Gospels, Canonical and Uncanonical: *Barnes*, 667.
 Gratry: Guide to Knowledge of God, 835.
 Greek Poets in English Verse: *Appleton*, 505.
 Green: Short History of English People, 999.
 Guthrie: Christ and Inheritance of Saints, 163.
 Guthrie: Out of Harness, 163.
 Hall: Into His Marvelous Light, 163.
 Harness, Out of: *Guthrie*, 163.
 Harper's Chicago and the World's Fair: *Ralph*, 340.
 Harper's Young People, 344.
 Harrison: Short Stories, 1000.
 Haven: Christus Consolator, etc., 669.
 Hawthorne, Personal Recollections of Nathaniel: *Bridge*, 675.
 Haycraft: Sybil's Repentance, etc., 1002.
 Hebbard: Introduction to Science of Thought, 336.
 Heinemann: Froebel Letters, 846.
 Helena's Cloud, etc., 680.
 Herms: Moltke, Life and Character, 170.
 Herron: Call of the Cross, 343.
 Hill: Foundations of Rhetoric, 165.
 Holding: In His Own Way, 175.
 Holding: Joy of the Deaconess, 680.
 Holy Spirit in Missions: *Gordon*, 661.
 Horner: Did a Hen or an Egg Exist First? etc., 165.
 Horswell: Suggestions for Study of English New Testament, 592.
 Horton: Verbum Dei, 993.
 Household Art: *Whetler*, 1000.
 How Marjorie Watched, etc., 680.
 Howells: Christmas Every Day, etc., 175.
 Hunt: Methodism in Buffalo, 677.
 Hurlbut: Illustrative Notes, 161, 994.
 Hurlbut: Seven Graded Sunday Schools, 1001.
 Hurst: Short History of the Christian Church, 676.
 Illustrative Notes: *Hurlbut* and *Doherty*, 161, 994.
 In His Own Way: *Holding*, 175.
 India and Malaysia: *Thoburn*, 167.
 Indian Wigwams and Northern Camp-Fires, Stories from: *Young*, 341.
 Interpretation of Nature: *Shaler*, 334.
 Into His Marvelous Light: *Hall*, 163.
 Jacob Winterton's Inheritance: *Searchfield*, 1002.
 Japan, American Missionary in: *Gordon*, 998.
 Japan, The Aims of: *Batchelor*, 998.
 Jesus, Life Critically Examined: *Strauss*, 334.
 Jewett: Bunny Stories, 176.
 Job, The Book of: *Watson*, 159.
 John, Gospel of: *Dods*, 159.
 Joshua, Book of: *Blaikie*, 666.
 Joy of Prayer: *Rohde*, 343.
 Joy of the Deaconess: *Holding*, 680.
 Junior League Work, Practical Hints on: *Ferguson*, 174.
 Kindergarten, The: *Wiggin*, 1000.
 Kings, First Book of: *Farrar*, 666.
 Kingsbury: Theodor Christlieb, 599.
 Kitty's Dream: *Robbins*, 848.
 Knight that Smote the Dragon: *Rand*, 175.
 Knowledge of God, Guide to: *Gratry*, 835.
 Lady Marjorie: *Leslie*, 1002.
 Laing: Simple Bible Lessons for Little Children, 342.
 Lamb, Wit and Wisdom of Charles: *North*, 176.
 Lancelotti: Pagan and Christian Rome, 678.
 Lareom: At the Beautiful Gate, etc., 1002.
 Latter-Day Eden, etc.: *Tuckley*, 1001.
 Lavisse: Youth of Frederick the Great, 173.
 Laws of the Soul: *Gifford*, 840.
 Lee: Making of a Man, 337.
 Leslie: Lady Marjorie, 1002.
 Let Him First Be a Man: *Venable*, 842.
 Liddon: Analysis of Epistle to Romans, 833.
 Life's Battle Won: *De Witt*, 1002.
 Lincoln, Abraham: *Coffin*, 349.
 Little Chicken Thieves: *Robinson*, 680.
 Little Sea Bird: *Robbins*, 848.
 Logic, Elements of Deductive: *Davis*, 326.
 London Daily Press: *Massingham*, 680.
 Lovett: James Gilmour of Mongolia, 998.
 MacArthur: Divine Balustrades, etc., 343.
 MacLaren: The Psalms, 666.
 MacMinn: Thrilling Scenes in the Persian Kingdom, 175.
 Making of a Man: *Lee*, 337.
 Man, Making of a: *Lee*, 337.
 Martyn, Henry, etc.: *Smith*, 172.
 Massachusetts History, Three Episodes: *Adams*, 169.
 Masses and Classes: *Tuckley*, 995.
 Massingham: London Daily Press, 680.
 Master Sower: *Davis*, 1001.
 Matheson: Messages of Old Religions, 329.
 Maud Humphrey's Book of Fairy Tales, 344.
 Maxwell: The Bishop's Conversion, 171.
 McGee: March of Methodism from Epworth, etc., 848.
 Men and Morals: *Stalker*, 848.
 Messages of Old Religions: *Matheson*, 329.
 Methodism, Annals of New York: *Seaman*, 510.

- Methodism in Buffalo: *Hunt*, 677.
 Methodism, March from Epworth, etc.: *McGee*, 848.
Meyer: Moses, the Servant of God, 502.
Millet: The Danube, etc., 338.
Mines: Tour Around New York, etc., 679.
 Miss Millie's Trying: *Bamford*, 344.
 Missions, Holy Spirit in: *Gordon*, 664.
Mitchell: Amos, etc., 322.
 Moltke, Life and Character: *Hermes*, 170.
 Morocco As It Is: *Bonsal*, 510.
 Moses, the Servant of God: *Meyer*, 502.
 Must the Chinese Go? etc.: *Baldwin*, 680.

 Natural Theology, Manual of: *Fisher*, 501.
 Nature, Interpretation of: *Shaler*, 334.
 New England Roads, Along: *Prince*, 512.
 New Era, etc.: *Strong*, 994.
 New Testament, Suggestions for Study of English: *Horswell*, 502.
 New York Methodism, Annals of: *Seaman*, 510.
 New York, Tour Around, etc.: *Mines*, 679.
 North: Wit and Wisdom of Charles Lamb, 176.

 Ohio, The Picturesque: *Clark*, 512.
 Old Religions, Messages of: *Matheson*, 329.
 Old Testament, Theology of: *Piepenbring*, 990.
 On Wheels, etc.: *Smith and Bonnell*, 174.
 Only Judith: *Rouse*, 1002.
 Other Essays from the Easy Chair: *Cartis*, 996.
 Our Brother in Yellow: *Banks*, 679.
 Out of Harness: *Guthrie*, 163.

 Paris, Praise of: *Child*, 341.
Parkhurst: Work and Workers, 1001.
Parsons: Amos Truelove, 1002.
 Pastor Amidst His Flock: *Wilcox*, 344.
 Pathway of Victory: *Girdlestone*, 1001.
 Paton, Story of John G.: *Paton*, 342.
Paton: Story of John G. Paton, 342.
 Paul, Gospel of: *Eccrett*, 499.
Peck: Rings and Love Knots, 176.
Peloubet: Select Notes, etc., 175.
Perkins: France Under the Regency, 506.
 Perplexed Philosopher, etc.: *George*, 335.
Perram: That Boy Mick, 175.
 Persian Kingdom, Thrilling Scenes in: *MacMinn*, 175.
 Persian Literature, etc.: *Reed*, 504.
 Personal Reminiscences of the War: *Bloodgood*, 1002.
Petrie: Ten Years' Digging in Egypt, 340.
 Philanthropy and Social Progress, 670.
 Philanthropy, Literature of: *Goodale*, 1000.
 Philippians, Epistle to: *Rainy*, 666.
 Philosopher, The Perplexed, etc.: *George*, 335.
 Picturesque Ohio: *Clark*, 512.
Piepenbring: Theology of Old Testament, 990.
Pileher, Elijah H.: *Pilcher*, 511.
Pilcher: Life and Labors of Elijah H. Pilcher, 511.
 Practical Hints on Junior League Work: *Ferguson*, 174.
 Prayer, Joy of: *Rohde*, 342.
 Primary Teacher, etc.: *Van Marter*, 1001.
Prince: Along New England Roads, 512.
 Psalms, The: *MacLaren*, 666.
 Pulpit Bible Reading: *Dockings*, *Emerson*, *Churchill*, 512.
 Puritan in Holland, England, and America: *Campbell*, 845.

 Quest and Vision: *Dawson*, 174.
Quiller-Couch: Warwickshire Avon, 343.

Rainy: Epistle to Philipians, 666.
Ralph: Harper's Chicago and the World's Fair, 340.
 Ramble Among Surnames: *Daniel*, 674.
Rand: Knight that Smote the Dragon, 175.
Ranger: Christmas Times in Crocus Family, 680.
 Reading Equity Case, Report of the Master, 847.
Redford: Four Centuries of Silence, 333.
Reed: Persian Literature, etc., 504.
 Religion for the Times: *Clark*, 836.
 Religious, Messages of Old: *Matheson*, 329.
 Revival Quiver: *Banks*, 1002.
 Rhetoric, Foundations of: *Hill*, 165.
Rhodes: History of United States, etc., 507.
 Rings and Love Knots: *Peck*, 176.
Ritchie: Records of Tennyson, Ruskin, Browning, 172.
 Roads: Christ Enthroned in Industrial World, 503.
Robbins: Daisy Downs, 848.
Robbins: Kitty's Dream, 848.
Robbins: Little Sea Bird, 848.
Robbins: Walter and Nellie, 848.
Robinson: Little Chicken Thieves, 680.
Rohde: Joy of Prayer, 343.
 Romans, Analysis of Epistle to: *Liddon*, 833.
 Rome, Pagan and Christian: *Lanciani*, 678.
Rouse: Only Judith, 1002.
 Ruskin, Life and Work of John: *Collingwood*, 843.

Saint-Amand: Duchess of Berry, etc., 173.
Savage: Evolution of Christianity, 162.
Seaman: Annals of New York Methodism, 510.
Searchfield: Jacob Winterton's Inheritance, 1002.
 Select Notes, etc.: *Peloubet*, 175.
 Seven Graded Sunday Schools: *Hurbut*, 1001.
 Seven Great Lights: *Tupper*, 343.
Shaler: Interpretation of Nature, 334.
 Sharp Eyes: *Gibson*, 175.
 Short Stories: *Harrison*, 1000.
Smith: Henry Martyn, etc., 172.
Smith: On Wheels, etc., 174.
 Socialism and the American Spirit: *Gilman*, 673.
 Socialism from Genesis to Revelation: *Sprague*, 838.
 Soul, Laws of the: *Gifford*, 840.
Sprague: Socialism from Genesis to Revelation, 838.
Stalker: Men and Morals, 843.
Stock: Story of Uganda, etc., 998.
Stokes: Acts of the Apostles, 666.
Strauss: Life of Jesus Critically Examined, 334.
Strong: The New Era, etc., 994.
Sunderland: The Bible, etc., 991.
 Surnames, Ramble Among: *Daniel*, 674.
Svan: Twice Tried, 680.
 Sybil's Repentance, etc.: *Haycraft*, 1002.

 Tennyson, Ruskin, Browning, Records of: *Ritchie*, 172.
 Ten Years' Digging in Egypt: *Petrie*, 340.
 That Boy Mick: *Perram*, 175.
Thayer: Books and Their Use, 668.
 Theology, Manual of Natural: *Fisher*, 501.
 Theology of the Old Testament: *Piepenbring*, 990.
Thoburn: India and Malaysia, 167.
 Thorn in the Flesh: *Etter*, 162.
 Thought, Introduction to Science of: *Herbert*, 336.
 Three Episodes of Massachusetts History: *Adams*, 169.

- Thrilling Scenes in the Persian Kingdom: *MacMillan*, 175.
- Through Christ to God: *Beet*, 331.
- Tiff with the Tiffins: *Currie*, 344.
- Tools and the Man: *Gladden*, 672.
- Tuckley: Masses and Classes, 995.
- Tuckley: The Latter-Day Eden, etc., 1001.
- Tudor: The Golden City, 848.
- Tupper: Seven Great Lights, 343.
- Twice Tried: *Swan*, 680.
- Uganda, Story of, etc.: *Stock*, 998.
- United States, History from Compromise of 1850: *Rhodes*, 507.
- Van Marter*: The Primary Teacher, 1001.
- Venable: Let Him First Be a Man, 842.
- Verbun Dei: *Horton*, 993.
- Walter and Nellie: *Robbins*, 848.
- Warren: Bible in World's Education, 497.
- Warwickshire Aven: *Quiller-Couch*, 343.
- Watson*: The Book of Job, 159.
- Watson*: Wordsworth's Grave, etc., 176.
- Wheeler*: Household Art, 1000.
- White*: Democracy of Christianity, 164.
- Whiton*: Gloria Patri, etc., 500.
- Wiggin*: The Kindergarten, 1000.
- Wilcox*: Pastor Amidst His Flock, 344.
- Williams*: Field Farings, 344.
- Wit and Wisdom of Charles Lamb: *North*, 176.
- Woman and Higher Education: *Brackett*, 1000.
- Women of Methodism, Representative: *Baag*, 338.
- Wordsworth's Grave, etc.: *Watson*, 176.
- Work and Workers: *Parkhurst*, 1001.
- Young*: Stories from Indian Wigwams, 341.
- Young Pilgrim: *A. L. O. E.*, 680.

1 4581

